Pages: 1-126

Town of Brookline

Board of Appeals Public Hearing

Re 500 Harvard Street

Remote Zoom

Wednesday, September 23, 2020

7:05 p.m. - 9:45 p.m.

A P P E A R A N C E S

Maria Morelli, AICP, Senior Planner
Planning and Community Development
Town of Brookline
333 Washington Street
Brookline, MA 0445
(617) 730-2670
mmorelli@brooklinema.gov

Board of Appeals
Jesse Geller, Chairman
Johanna Schneider, Board Member
Kate Poverman, Board Member
Randolph Meiklejohn, Board Member

Victor Panak, Planning Department
Brandon Schrenker, Walker Consultants
Jim Fitzgerald, Environmental Partners
Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert, Attorney
Danny Danesh, Applicant
Scott Thornton, VAI
Derrick Roach, VAI

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. GELLER: So it being a little after 7:00, we are reconvening our hearing. This is an application for a comprehensive permit. This involves property at 500 Harvard Street.

For the record, the board this evening is comprised of myself, Jesse Geller, Johanna Schneider, Kate Poverman, and hiding over in the corner is Randolph Meiklejohn, in the nice green room.

Before we begin, I will confirm that all members and other persons anticipated to participate on the agenda are present and can hear me. Members, when I call your name, please respond in the affirmative. Kate Poverman?

MS. POVERMAN: I am here, and I can hear you.

MR. GELLER: Great. Johanna Schneider?

MS. SCHNEIDER: I'm here.

MR. GELLER: And Randolph Meiklejohn? Randolph, take off your mute for a minute.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: I was also switching

networks. Sorry. I'm on a better network now. Am I to say I'm present, and I'm Randolph Meiklejohn?

MR. GELLER: Only if you're present and are Randolph Meiklejohn.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Yes, and yes.

MR. GELLER: Thank you. Staff, when I call your name, please respond in the affirmative. Maria Morelli?

MS. MORELLI: I'm here.

MR. GELLER: And Victor Panak?

MR. PANAK: I am here.

MR. GELLER: Great. Thank you. All speakers should identify themselves by name prior to speaking. This hearing of the ZBA in open session is being conducted remotely and in a manner that is consistent with Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 executive order concerning the current state of emergency in the Commonwealth due to the outbreak of the Covid-19 virus.

In order to mitigate the transmission of Covid-19, we have been advised to practice physical distancing, and a requirement of the

open meeting law that public bodies such as this conduct their hearings in a publicly accessible physical location has been suspended.

The governor's order, which is posted with agenda materials for this hearing, authorizes this body to meet entirely remotely so long as adequate public access is provided. Adequate public access does not include public participation, unless such participation is required by law.

This hearing will feature public comment. For this hearing, the ZBA is convening by video conference via Zoom, as posted on the town's calendar, which identifies how the public may access the hearing.

Be advised that this hearing is and that some attendees may be participating by video conference. Accordingly, please be aware that others may be able to see you, and take care not to screen share your computer. Anything that you broadcast may be captured by the recording.

All supporting materials that have been provided to members of this body are

available on the town website and attached to this hearing's invitation. The hearing will follow the agenda, unless I note otherwise.

Finally, and before turning to the agenda for tonight's specific hearing, I'll cover some ground rules that will permit clear and effective conduct of our business and help to ensure accurate meeting minutes.

I'll introduce each speaker on the agenda, and after they conclude their remarks, I'll invite each member, by name, to provide any comment, questions, or motions. Please hold yours until your name is called. Please also remember to mute your phone or computer when you are not speaking and to speak clearly and in a way that helps generate accurate minutes.

Before responding, please wait until the floor is yielded to you, and state your name before speaking. If members wish to engage in private conversation with other members, please do so through me. Finally, each vote taken in this hearing will be conducted by roll call vote.

For the public comment component of

this hearing, I will first ask members of the public who wish to speak to identify themselves by name and address only. I will call on each by name. Please enter your name into the chat section. You can find the chat icon on the bottom of your screen. Click on this icon, and the chat window will appear on the right.

Our host, which for purposes of allowing people to be promoted, will be Victor, will cue members in the order in which it is received. Additionally, we will ask if members of the public who are calling in would like to speak in favor of or in opposition to the project. Credit goes to Mark Zuroff for those canned and eloquent words.

Tonight's agenda will involve a staff report given by Maria. Maria will raise a number of topics. Maria, I won't specifically go into your agenda. We will review the public hearing schedule for this matter.

We will have traffic peer review, parking peer review. We'll give the applicant an opportunity to respond to peer review, and then we will open the floor for public comment.

I've said this before. I would ask a number of things of people who want to offer testimony. As I read before, please start by giving us your name and your address. Listen to what other people have to say. There's no need to repeat information that others have provided. We certainly want to hear from you if you agree with what a predecessor said, but that should be sufficient.

If you have new information, we absolutely want to hear it. Any testimony you offer this evening should be dedicated to the topics of this evening's portion of this broader hearing. So tonight, in particular, traffic and parking are the topics.

In addition, I think given the fact that in January, which is a very long time ago, we did not take public testimony, I will allow a certain amount of broader comment. However, I would note, generally, that the next hearing in this matter, which is scheduled for next week, September 30 at 7:00 p.m., we are going to be hearing peer review on architectural and design review matters. And should you, in your

infinite wisdom, decide that your comments are more appropriate to that hearing, we will give an opportunity for public comment at that point in time.

I'm just trying to create an efficient opportunity here. After we hear public comment, we will then have an opportunity -- we, the board members -- to have a discussion, and if appropriate, in the context of what we have heard, give some direction and feedback to the developer, which will then lead into, hopefully, an efficient and useful next hearing.

One thing I didn't mention is that we are recording this hearing in a number of manners. We have a transcript that is being taken. Also, the video is being recorded, and we may or may not be on Brookline Cable. So there are lots of different sources for people who want to get the information from this specific hearing.

As I've also said before, transcripts of prior hearings, all materials pertinent to this matter, are available on the town's website. Maria will give you the information.

She can lead people who have not found it where they need to look. Maria, any other administrative details?

MS. MORELLI: Just a few. Thank you. I just wanted to mention that the deadline to close this hearing is December 16, 2020. I do understand that the applicant is not willing to grant an extension. So I just would remind you, Mr. Chair, to at least address that with the applicant at some point, because we do have a really tight schedule.

Town meeting is November 17, 18, 19 and 30, as well as December 2 and 3. So those would be times where the ZBA would not be able to meet. So at some point before the end of this hearing, I would like to go over the schedule with the ZBA and the applicant.

Just a couple of things. I did inform the applicant about the peer review budget for traffic and parking peer review. So I can go over that now or later, but I do have a request of the applicant to provide funds of $2,825.

MR. GELLER: Make the request, and let's have a response from the applicant.

MS. MORELLI: So that would -- if we could promote Mr. Danesh.

MR. PANAK: David or Danny, or both?

MS. MORELLI: We're going to get started with Danny Danesh. I'm sorry. Danny Danesh, please. Sorry. I don't think we can hear Mr. Danesh.

MR. GELLER: He's muted.

MR. DANESH: Hello. Can you hear me?

MR. GELLER: Yes.

MS. MORELLI: Yes.

MR. DANESH: Yes, hi. I am -- this is Danny Danesh. We are okay to increase the budget.

MR. GELLER: Thank you.

MS. MORELLI: Thank you.

MR. GELLER: Other administrative details?

MS. MORELLI: Not at this time. Thank you.

MR. GELLER: So Maria, why don't you start on your staff report?

MS. MORELLI: Actually, that was just -- that was very brief. I really didn't have to

go through any details right now. I might weigh in later related to this topic. All I had were some administrative details. So we can continue with the peer review presentation.

MR. GELLER: I understand we have Jim Fitzgerald here for peer review from Environmental Partners, and Jim is here to review the applicant's traffic assessment.

MR. FITZGERALD: Can you hear me?

MR. GELLER: Yes.

MR. FITZGERALD: Jim Fitzgerald with Environmental Partners. Thank you very much. So we have performed a couple of peer reviews for this project so far from the traffic perspective. We have -- the original traffic assessment was prepared by VAI back on -- dated March 13, 2020, then updated again on May 8, 2020.

Environmental Partners performed a traffic peer review on June 26, to which we received comments back from VAI, dated July 31, and we issued our findings on September 17 of the back and forth. And so what I'll focus on tonight is really the most relevant issues that

were not necessarily completely addressed in the back and forth.

First off, the location of the driveway was a topic of discussion, the fact that it is located for the site on Kenwood, as opposed to on Harvard. The discussion had to do with the fact that in order for motorists to -- any motorist that was exiting the -- that would exit the driveway would be required to turn right out of the driveway onto Kenwood, as opposed to turning left and accessing Harvard Street, which is only 70 feet away.

Our concern -- one of our concerns had to do with the fact that it is so close to Harvard Street, and most motorists -- one could say all motorists are likely to want to meander through the residential neighborhoods in order to get back to Harvard Street once again, and so that travel distance is -- instead of 70 feet is 2600 feet.

The concern had to do not so much with the volume of traffic that the site will be generated -- generating and what that would do as far as delays on those roadways. It's more

from the standpoint of it being a very long travel route. During our traffic counts -- it's an existing -- currently, as you know, the existing site has driveways on both roadways, and during our traffic counts, we did observe one of the vehicles making the illegal left onto Kenwood to make a quick getaway onto Harvard. So certainly, that is a concern.

Currently, there is already a one-way sign opposite that driveway, yet motorists probably from time to time stretch the rules a little bit and make this illegal turn. So that's one of the concerns having to do with the travel distance for these motorists -- for every motorist that exits the garage.

One of the rebuttals that we heard back is that while the garage right now is being proposed as a relatively minimal number of parking spaces -- I will not get into that topic. That's something that Walker Parking will get into shortly.

We're focusing on trip generation based on industry standards. And one could assume that if a motorist accessing either the

residential or the retail uses does not -- do not have a place to park on Harvard Street, they probably would turn onto Kenwood and find an on street parking space perhaps there, as well. And then there again, the cut-through along this long travel distance through the neighborhoods, which -- again, nonoperational concerns, just a matter of driver frustration.

Every time you have to leave your driveway, you have to meander like a half a mile to get back to the main road again. We wanted to make sure that motorists drive appropriately. There's currently no signs of speeding along the roadways right now from the information that we've seen, but we're just identifying all the pros and cons.

So one of the things that came up having to do with that -- you know, the site is anticipated to generate approximately 128 vehicles over the course of a day. One of the questions that we raised was where should -- where would be the optimal location for a driveway to be located. Should it be on Harvard, should it be on Kenwood, and there's certainly

pros and cons to each. And certainly, one benefit to having it on Kenwood instead of Harvard is the fact that motorists exiting and exiting [sic] that driveway no longer have to conflict with the pedestrians walking along the sidewalk, and that certainly is a benefit.

However, there's also the negative side of it, and requiring the exiting motorists to all meander through that neighborhood. So again, there are pluses and minuses to both scenario -- scenarios, I mean.

Another topic that we looked at, as always, had to do with site distance. So with the driveway being located along Kenwood, we were considering site distance for motorists entering into Kenwood in relation to that drive -- the motorists exiting the driveway.

VAI responded to our comments by performing a minimal amount of speed observations along -- at the actual corner, identifying that the speeds turning the corner are relatively slow, on average about 12 miles per hour, depending on the time of day. They only, however, looked during the peak periods.

Typically, when we look at speeds, we look over a 24- or 48-hour period to get a better idea of what the true average is, but there doesn't appear to be relatively high speeds turning into this roadway, certainly.

Even still, the fact that the driveway is so closely located to Harvard Street results in the fact that the available site distance is barely acceptable, stopping site distance for motorists entering into the street versus the motorists exiting the driveway. If the speeds are one to two miles per hour faster, we would be in violation. But technically, the site distance does barely meet the speeds that were observed.

With regards to site distance and visibility exiting the driveway, another topic that came up had to do with on street parking. There appears to be one legitimate parking space along Kenwood between Harvard and the driveway, and we would recommend that that parking space be eliminated.

On occasion, you can see two vehicles parking between the driveway and Harvard, but

that second parking space being so close to the crosswalk isn't really -- is not really a legal parking spot. So really, by eliminating parking on that short piece of roadway, you would be eliminating one parking space, and the transportation and their recent document actually also agrees with the notion of eliminating that parking spot.

While we're talking about parking, along the Harvard side of the project, originally, the applicant had proposed adding a space where the existing driveway is currently located. The idea was to allow for loading -- for the space to be loading -- allowed for loading only during a three-hour span, from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m., and to be a metered parking space during all other times.

Our concern with this, however, is the use of that space perhaps as an on street parking space would limit the ability for other uses, such as loading, unloading, Uber, things like that, trash pickup, during those other time periods of the daytime. And given the I believe it was a 65 percent reduction that the applicant

is assuming on trip generation to account for things like public transportation, walking, biking, etcetera, etcetera, we would recommend that there be some more flexibility for other uses, again, like Uber and ride share and things like that, to really promote those uses, especially given the assumptions that were made during this project, whether it would be from trip generation and/or parking. We certainly do not want to encourage double parking.

The applicant had stated that, you know, not -- that there aren't any designated loading zones in other areas, and not every project has loading zones, and therefore, it might be considered acceptable. In our opinion, it's problematic and something that we should not be promoting or allowing. So by allowing that parking spot to be used for other uses all day long instead of just for three hours, I think that would be a wise decision.

The transportation board weighed in on it, and actually also agreed that that one parking space would be put to better use as a full time loading zone for ride share, etcetera.

Therefore, as a result of all this, we would have a net loss of one parking space, one on street parking space as a result, which would be that one over on Kenwood.

Regarding trip generation, there was a bit of a back and forth having to do with the fact that if we -- if the developer only is providing six parking spaces, that therefore, in theory, the trip generation should be less. We do not support this idea.

We follow industry standards through ITE, and the two topics are -- we believe to be independent. Whether or not motorists find on street parking or try to find on street parking that don't fit in the garage, again, I will let that conversation take place with Walker, who will be speaking shortly.

Next -- pardon my delay. And that, in summary, is -- concludes our findings.

MS. POVERMAN: So I have a question, a methodological question. This is Kate Poverman. In trip generation analysis, are they based on number of units or parking spaces?

MR. FITZGERALD: They're based on

number of units for the current development and square footage for the retail element of it.

MS. POVERMAN: Because I was comparing -- I think my concern is that in addition to reasons you refer to, there might be an under-counting of trip generation in this particular case, because I compared the trip generation analysis that is provided by VAI, which says there would be approximately 128 trips, which they then, you know, reduced by existing side trips, etcetera.

The thing is I compared the trip generation analysis in this case with the analysis done for the following properties, all on Harvard Street: 500 Harvard Street, 30 units; 445 Harvard Street, 25 units; 455 and 420. So what I found is that the analysis for 445, where there are 25 units -- so 445 Harvard Street, 25 units, 302 trips were estimated to be generated, and that is five fewer units than we have here and double the amount of trips that are anticipated.

Similarly, 455 Harvard has 17 units and was estimated to have 114 trips generated

per day. Number 420, I think it was 36 units, estimated 240 trips per day. So I don't think traffic is going to be a make or break on this case, but I do have concerns that the number of trips has been underestimated, especially as I think you made a point that as of now, there's no way that the analysis can take into account Uber trips and FedEx trips and things like that.

MR. FITZGERALD: Right. So to answer your question about those other developments, I would have to take a closer look at what they had assumed. You know, in a lot of instances, different assumptions are made, and sometimes reductions may not be included with the notion of being conservative.

So in this instance, backup information was used to justify the reduction for bike, transit, walking, etcetera, and that was justifiable. So it's very possible that between the reports, there may have been different reductions that were taken. Regardless, they would have been -- had to be justifiable for us to have accepted them.

You know, in the end, if reductions

were not included in those other developments, their numbers probably would be a lot higher, I mean, like I said, 65 percent reduction here to account for the uses that I had mentioned. So it's pretty decent.

Therefore, one of the other things I want to bring up had to do with the notion of mitigation for pedestrians. Right now, you know, the Kenwood-Harvard intersection is literally at the front door of this site. The site is anticipated to generate a lot of pedestrians, again, taking a hefty reduction for them, peds, bikes, transit, etcetera.

Therefore, it would be also our recommendation that consideration be made for upgrading the pedestrian accommodations literally outside the front door at the intersection to provide 88 compliant ramps, in the meanwhile, tightening those corners a little bit. When you tighten the corners, you shorten the crossing distances, and you do help to slow down traffic.

Remember, I said that their site distance is adequate by a slim margin of one to

two miles per hour, which equates to about five feet. So certainly by tightening the corner, you would help make it a little bit safer, and accommodate all of those pedestrians that are being generated by the site.

MR. GELLER: Thank you. Kate, any other questions?

MS. POVERMAN: Actually, I was just wondering, in general, is the industry planning on figuring out how to account for the impact of Uber, etcetera in traffic analysis?

MR. FITZGERALD: I actually thought you were going to ask the question about Covid.

MS. POVERMAN: No, actually, I do -- actually, I do, now that you mentioned it, but first --

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, I think especially in communities like Brookline, it's a very important thing, and yes, there -- you know, it takes years of data to compile -- to figure out what these -- what those contributions might be. And certainly one way on perhaps a larger scale development might have been to collect empirical data elsewhere to --

you know, as a basis, since no great information is out there available to have a similar site and, you know, comparing the two to really identify what that number really should be. But not yet.

But as far as Covid is concerned, certainly, right now, as I'm sure we are all aware, the traffic volumes have lowered quite a bit, and it's a huge topic of discussion whether or not they will return to where they were before. In theory, at some point, they will.

I mean, right now, there's probably a reduction in trips because a lot of people are working from home, but then again, a lot of people aren't taking public transit either. So that could increase it. So it's an interesting time to project traffic.

MS. POVERMAN: Actually, I've read a couple of articles in the Atlantic and the New York Times, for example, which have commented on how car sales are actually increasing now, because people do not want to use public transportation and -- so that the millennials, who always foreswore private car ownership are,

in fact, getting many more cars than had previously been anticipated. So as you say, there are a whole lot of things up in the air in terms of determining what future traffic is going to look like.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah, and certainly that impacts traffic. It also impacts parking.

MS. POVERMAN: Yeah.

MR. GELLER: Great. Johanna, any questions, thoughts?

MS. SCHNEIDER: Yes, I have a few questions. Hi, Jim. How are you?

MR. FITZGERALD: Hi. Good. How are you doing?

MS. SCHNEIDER: Nice to see you.

MR. FITZGERALD: Likewise.

MS. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to pick up on Kate's question about Uber and Lyft, and I guess I have a few questions about this. One is do you have a vision of where an ideal spot -- I know you mentioned, you know, a loading zone for this or not. You know, given that they are taking such a hefty reduction, you know, based on their transit mode slip -- they think people

are not going to have private vehicles, probably people will instead use Uber and Lyft -- for a project in this location, where would be the least impactful place for Ubers and Lyfts to pick up and drop off residents of this development without unduly impacting either neighboring properties or the traffic flow along Harvard Street? Where would they put this if we could pick?

MR. FITZGERALD: Well, you know what, I think the spot that was identified -- I had talked about earlier where there was going to be parking all day, with the exception of the three-hour span of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. -- would be a good location from the standpoint that it's right on Harvard Street. You know, you're not sending cars down through the residential neighborhoods off Kenwood. So that would probably be a good location of any to have those kind of accommodations.

MS. SCHNEIDER: So a related question to that is I know that in the City of Boston, the City -- BTD is working with Uber and Lyft to have designated shared Uber and Lyft pickup points.

Do we have the -- Maria, this may be a question for you, or Jim, you may know this because you work in town all the time.

Do we have anything like that in Coolidge Corner, for example, like a consolidated Uber, Lyft pickup, so that when you are, you know, going to a particular -- this is the way it works in Boston -- you're calling for an Uber to a certain address, and you get directed to this common pickup spot or you get dropped off at this common pickup spot.

It seems to me that if we already have something like that in Coolidge Corner, a solution for this development would be, you know, for the board to require them to work with Uber and Lyft to have that shared spot, which probably makes more sense than sticking it, you know, on Kenwood or whatever as their go-to pickup, drop-off spot?

MS. MORELLI: So that's an excellent question, Ms. Schneider. I know that Todd Kirrane, who's the transportation administrator, and the police department often consult on where Uber and Lyft pins should go. They call them

pins. So we've talked about this near like the destination retailers, like the marijuana retailers. So they will designate pins.

As for a comprehensive -- like a map, that, I don't know about, but I do know that there are pins designated. So I can talk to Todd Kirrane further just to get a more -- just a global map of that, if you want.

MS. SCHNEIDER: Yeah, I mean, I -- you know, and Jim, I don't know if you have an opinion of this, whether there's a place -- you know, if we were to require the developer to push its Uber and Lyft pickups, is it that spot, or is there someplace, you know, elsewhere there is an existing pin, for example, where we would -- we, the town, or we would require the developer to do this in a way so that it's not burdening, you know, this corner of the neighborhood more than it needs to?

And I think -- you know, this is just me weighing in. You know, as we see more and more developments come through that are going to be what we would consider traditionally under-parked, the reliance on Uber and Lyft is going to

go up, and I think we, as a town, need to do a little bit more planning to accommodate that piece of the traffic.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah, I think -- sorry.

MS. SCHNEIDER: No, go ahead.

MR. FITZGERALD: I was just going to say yeah, I agree with you 100 percent. I think that's very important. I think the other thing to keep in mind here is that it has to be -- the pins or the stations cannot be few and far between, because then you're not really promoting that usage, and you know they're going to do it anyway, right. So they'll just pull over in spots where they're not supposed to or double park or whatever.

So it's going to be convenient and, you know, make sense, but certainly -- you know, being well thought out would certainly be great overall for the town as a whole.

MS. SCHNEIDER: My next question has to deal with the location of the driveway on Kenwood, and I just want to make sure that I completely understand what the issue is.

You know, so it's looking like it's an only right turn, right, and it's so close to the corner of Harvard. So is the issue -- and you mentioned a couple of different things. Maybe it's all of these things. But is the issue that we're worried that people are going to make an illegal left turn out of the driveway of this development?

Is the issue that drivers are going to be frustrated, in which case, you know, it's a marketing issue for the owner and not really, you know, necessarily a public safety issue, or is it that we're worried that, you know, whereas previously somebody coming through this corner might have turned left or right, they're only going to turn right, and it's going to funnel more traffic through the neighborhood.

But this part of the neighborhood, regrettably, is already sort of a cut-through from Harvard Street anyway. So is that really a material impact? I guess I just want to understand a little bit more what the real problem with this is.

MR. FITZGERALD: Everything that you

just said I agree with. You know, as far as the illegal left turn, the potential for illegal left turn is certainly something that we typically try to design to prevent or -- actually, I shouldn't say prevent, but discourage. So there could be a tendency to do that more. So that's part of it. You know, I think it really comes down to, like I was saying before, about the pluses and minuses, and the notion of a motorist -- yes, there's already cut-through traffic in the neighborhood. I get that.

One thing that we just wanted to bring up as one of the cons for this scenario is the notion that you're starting so close to Harvard Street, and, you know, as a motorist we -- sometimes when we run into things like driver frustration as a result of either delay at an intersection or because there's a long cut-through, what happens? People tend to speed up and get to where they want to get a little bit faster if they're in a rush.

It's not a quantifiable thing. It's just -- you know, as far as a big picture kind of

planning idea, this is not great. But then the benefit is, however, that you're no longer having a driveway on Harvard Street where there are either more pedestrians walking along that sidewalk that are no longer having that conflict with the motorists going into the driveway unexpectedly. So again, it's pluses and minuses.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I have one more question, which has to do with your comments relating to site distance. I think you said a couple of things about site distance. One is that it seems like the developer's traffic consultant did not provide as much speed data to analyze this as we might have wanted, that you only provided it for peak hours, and normally, you would expect it over a 24- to 48-hour period. Yes, you said that, right?

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

MS. SCHNEIDER: But then you said that based on the data that they gave us, the site distance registered as barely acceptable. Did they give us enough data to really be able to make that assessment, given that it seems like

it's very much on the margin, it's barely acceptable.

You mentioned that like a little tiny bit more speed here and there would tip it, you know, under acceptable. Do we need more speed data over a wider range of hours in order to feel fully comfortable that the site distance here is adequate?

MR. FITZGERALD: In a perfect world, if that was provided, yes. I mean, that would be -- to really quantify it and get down in more detail, that would be helpful. I think that in the end, the driveway is where it is, and I think that, you know, certainly, again, by tightening those corners a little bit, that might help slow down a vehicle by a couple of miles an hour, if that's necessary even, based on the additional information, if additional information was provided.

So, I mean, for us to really come to a firm conclusion, the methodology that they use makes sense, and there were some instances where the speeds that were collected -- the radar -- they used a radar gun, and the radar gun doesn't

go -- does not go below ten miles per hour, and so they -- it just indicates less than ten. For those instances, which there were quite a few of, they ended up by assuming a speed of nine miles per hour in light of trying to be conservative. Now, we're taking the information being provided for face value.

So perhaps their numbers may be a little bit even conservative. But to your point, in order to know for sure what is the actual speed turning that corner, we would need -- you know, we would need the NATR tube count at that location, at the driveway location.

You know, we also pointed out in our report that, in theory, it appeared as if they collected the speed information right on the corner where the vehicle is turning, instead of in front of the drivewway along Kenwood itself. And, in theory, a motorist turning right as they enter into the side street might start accelerating, perhaps. But the notion here is that with the motorist turning, if they have site distance to that motorist, then they're not going to accelerate, in theory. They'll see the

motorist, and they will slow down instead of accelerate.

MS. SCHNEIDER: Sorry. I'm going to ask one more question. I know I said that was my last question.

MR. FITZGERALD: No problem.

MS. SCHNEIDER: Are you feeling like -- I mean, I know that you recommended, and I think, you know, the transportation board did, as well, a number of mitigation measures, traffic calming, slowing type measures. Do you feel like if we were to require the developer to implement those measures, we can get to a point where the -- perhaps suboptimal, barely acceptable site distance is okay?

MR. FITZGERALD: It's possible. It could only help. It would be at the same or slower speeds entering into the roadway. It's really hard for me to quantify what that would be. You know, when it comes to traffic calming measures, there are a lot of studies available out there, with a wide range of findings as far as their level of effectiveness.

You know, certainly by tightening the

corners a little bit, it helps slow down a little bit. It's not a major traffic calming element. You know, it's just -- it helps tighten, as well as improve the pedestrian crossing, get the pedestrian out of the street a little bit faster.

So it's hard to quantify what impact tightening those corners a little bit might be, because, of course, the corners could be tightened a little bit, but then, again, we also have to make sure that they're designed for the appropriate size vehicle, too, won't be able to swing in, whatever the design truck would be, trash truck, school bus, stuff like that.

MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

MR. GELLER: Randolph?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Randolph Meiklejohn. The questions I had have already been asked by Johanna and Kate. I just have one comment, and I think it's a minor thing, but Johanna and Jim both made mention of, you know, cut-through traffic in the neighborhood. And, you know, my understanding is that this neighborhood has no cut-through traffic because of the Columbia

Street at the back, you know, at the northwest corner having been closed in the '80s, or even earlier. And my observation is that it's a very sleep cul-de-sac, and, you know, it makes sense, therefore, that we might worry about the behavior of a frustrated motorist, you know, driving quickly through there.

You know, if that's the street layout you've had for years, you know, you could look at the next house on Kenwood and say, well, you know, at some point, that house is going to sell, and there's a new person living there, and when they start living there, they're going to have to learn that, you know, you shouldn't try to make it to Harvard Street. You should go through the neighborhood.

And, you know, one of the ways to look at this project is that, you know, however many of these residents, you know, have a car and use it turning that corner and going out, you're just introducing a lot of new people to the neighborhood who've got to learn the rules and not reduce safety for others. You know, I've only parked there when I've gone to the site

visits for this project, and, you know, you don't find anything going in Kenwood. You find it on the way out on Verndale or whatever the other street is. That's all.

MR. GELLER: Thank you. Jim, I'm just going to ask my usual global questions, because I think that the prior inquisitors did a terrific job, and they essentially touched on many questions that I had that were more specific. The science works.

MR. FITZGERALD: I'm sorry, what?

MR. GELLER: The science works.

MR. FITZGERALD: Science works.

MR. GELLER: They've done this correctly. The conclusions are achieved through the right assumptions, subject to your comments, obviously.

MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. You know, again, we're in an urban location here, right, and so we're somewhat limited on what our options are, and sometimes it's -- you know, the challenge is what is the lesser of two evils, you know, a driveway here, a driveway there. But yes, the science works.

I think that with the parking space on the corner there being not used for a parking -- a metered parking space, but actually a loading zone, I think it would be the way to go, as well as eliminating the parking between the site driveway and Harvard, as well as upgrading those corners with 88 compliant ramps and tightening the corners of that, and I think -- for the location, I think yes, that would work.

MR. GELLER: Thank you. Next on our agenda, we are going to undertake -- we're going to hear from our parking peer reviewer. I understand Art is not here tonight, but Brandon Schrenker is here, on behalf of Walker, to provide us with peer review for parking.

MR. SCHRENKER: Hello. Can you hear me?

MR. GELLER: Yes.

MR. SCHRENKER: Great.

MR. GELLER: Brandon, how are you?

MR. SCHRENKER: Good. How are you?

MR. GELLER: Excellent.

MR. SCHRENKER: I may at times want to share your screen just to explain a few things,

but what I'd like to do, similar to Jim, is to hit on some of the highlights, the main points of our memorandum.

Similar to Jim's, we did an initial review. We got some feedback from the applicant's team, and we've also last week issued some responses to that. So I'll cover those from a high level standpoint, and then, obviously, open it up for any questions you have for me.

So just to reiterate the program, 30 residential units, three studios, 17 one-beds, seven two-beds, and three three-beds, approximately 1700 square feet of ground floor retail, and with that is provided six parking spaces in the building, and as noted, the one on street space, so a total overall of the seven spaces for this zoning district. And this is also at Coolidge Corner, a design overlay district.

Purely from a zoning perspective, what that would mean is two spaces for the one- and two-bedroom units, 2.3 spaces for the three-bedroom units, a ten percent increase on top of

that for visitors and trades people, and then for the retail, it's now a maximum. So it's one space per 200 square foot of ground floor retail, maximum.

There was a typo with regards to the total spaces. So the total spaces required by zoning, considering no retail spaces, would be 68 spaces, and then a maximum of nine spaces for the retail parking. As noted, the information provided provides six spaces for the residents. That's a ratio of .2 spaces per unit, and then that additional space outside, if you were to include that in it, it would be .23 spaces per unit.

The information provided doesn't really get into the methodology for, you know, justifying that ratio, but just, rather, you know, kind of anecdotally, the residents, most won't have vehicles. So what Walker did, which is what we typically do for one of our peer reviews, is take a look at census data for these tracks and use that to take a look at the parking demand and what range we think that would fall into just based on the census data we have. This

is where I'll share my screen for a moment. Give me one second here. I'm sorry. I can't share it, so I will talk you through it.

MS. MORELLI: I think if Victor is available, he can give you permission. Victor?

MR. PANAK: Go ahead, Brandon. You should be all set.

MR. SCHRENKER: Thank you. So I just want to zoom in here for a second. So what we did from a track perspective is the track that we're in right here is 4003, and that is -- this is obviously Brookline. The point with this is that this track is 47 percent renters. Obviously, this project is, you know, a rental unit.

So what we also did was given this proximity to the Green Line and these adjacent tracks, we said let's bracket this or take a step back a little bit and say what if we also considered these two adjacent tracks that are primarily renter and are right on the Green Line -- obviously, we're also on the Route 66 bus perspective -- and then that just gives maybe a more global look at what the real range could be

for this site, taking into account public transportation, taking into account the -- from a rental standpoint.

So I'll go back, and just bear with me from a timing perspective. So we looked at those three tracks. So if we look at just the track that's Brookline, the track 4003 that I had mentioned, that falls in that range of about .7 to .95 spaces per unit per demand, which is commonly what we have been finding in this area of Brookline using the census data.

Looking at those other two tracks, which are the tracks in Allston-Brighton, that ratio, using the same methodology, comes out to be somewhere in the range of .4 to .6 spaces per unit, which would be about 12 to 18 spaces for this project. And it should be noted that does not include the visitor parking. That's just, you know, purely looking at the demand generated from those units in those two tracks.

So, you know, whether you're looking at those two tracks or this one, you're somewhere at a .4 to .6 range for those two, or a .7 to .95 for the Brookline track, and I think

that just gives a -- you know, kind of the boundaries that we could be considering from a defendable parking demand standpoint based on units.

If you then add in that ten percent, then that just kicks it up a little bit. So where I said 12 to 18 spaces before, it would be more like 16 to 20 spaces if you take into account that ten percent for visitors and trades people.

We did receive some feedback from Vanasse on this. There's a few points that I just want to hit on along those lines. One is just with regards to some Brookline warrants that the town is currently considering.

Just the point here would be as a peer review, we're looking at, you know, what are the requirements now and what we think -- you know, where we think parking demand will be based on our own methodology.

We're obviously coming in with factors that are lower than what the zoning is. So we do understand that there are warrants that are being considered to lower the requirements, but

right now, we're considering, you know, what this project is and what the Town of Brookline requires now.

The response also included eight projects that are approximate to this property along Harvard, and the range of parking supply for those is from zero per unit up to .92 per unit.

So just to quickly touch on those, five of those properties have essentially zero parking. One property has one space. The point would be, though, that these properties were built about 100 years ago, between 1890 and 1915. So it's not something that I would consider as a comp for a development happening today. That's just part of Brookline's overall garage orphans that have been identified by the town.

One of the other projects is 384 Harvard Street. This is a development that is age restricted, is elderly, and it's also affordable housing for the entire facility, so just a somewhat different user group. That parking ratio for that facility is similar to

what's being proposed here.

And then for the 420 and 455 Harvard Street -- and again, these are 40B projects -- those had ratios in the range of .59 to .92. So again, those are just, you know, in the order of magnitude of three or so times what's being proposed on this project. With that said, those projects did have a larger amount of retail space, which would contribute to a higher demand. However, it's still, you know, a substantially higher parking demand provided.

The last piece of information was noted that the MAPC, which is the Metropolitan Area Planning Council, has been -- has issued a report, called the perfect fit report, that is providing evidence for reducing parking. In addition, MAPC wrote a letter for this project, noting that they feel the seven spaces is adequate for this, and again, that represents a ratio of .23 spaces per unit.

Just to touch on that report, we at Walker are obviously aware of it, and we've done our research into this report, a cliff notes version. They studied about 200 locations

throughout Boston -- or the metro area and outside of Boston to get a feel for what is the actual demand that residential sites are seeing, you know, primarily by studying at night when residential parking peaks, to gain an understanding of what's been provided for supply and what's actually there for demand.

In general, we're in agreement with their methodologies. We think it's good data, and it helps justify lower parking ratios. However, for this particular project, in our opinion, the data that they've collected doesn't justify a demand ratio this low of .2.

To give -- and again, I'll share my screen one more time. So this is a website that is from MAPC that shows their data, and it's actually a really useful website. I encourage people to take a look at it if they haven't seen this already. But this shows all the data points that they have.

Unfortunately, Brookline was not part of this study, but there are a few data points that are nearby. So as an example, this is one that I cite in our report, which is known as

Gateway. So this is right on Beacon, so it's right on the city line, about a mile closer to the city.

And so the demand that they actually calculated at that location is a .39, so right about at that .4 that we're talking about as the low number. And as I mentioned, you know, it's closer to Boston. It's in the Fenway area. So that's a good comp for taking a look at what the lower end of a reasonable ratio may be for this development.

You'll also see a cluster here, which is, you know, relatively proximate to our site. There's three projects there. Each of those -- the calculated demand that's in this information provided is .58, .58, and .78. So once again, it seems to correlate well with the numbers that we're calculating using a different methodology.

This is good data. This is, you know, actual field information, but it seems to be relatively in line with what we're looking at when we're considering purely, you know, looking at census data and drawing conclusions from that.

The other important piece that I'll note here is just -- you know, you can see it's almost essentially like a bell curve of the data points that have been collected here, and this is -- so this is actual demand, so .2, .4, .6, and you can see really where the cluster of most developments are. Now, all these projects have different characteristics, different locations, different reasons that they fall in that track. But whenever you collect statistical data like this, you can look for, you know, trends.

And what you'll see is typically most projects fall in this middle zone, I'll say in the range of .4 to 1 per unit, and I think that's important to understand. And when you look at the lower end of it, what we're talking about, .2, there's only a few data points. It's about 7 1/2 percent of those data points.

It should also be noted that many of those -- about half or more of those are elderly housing developments, and more than half of those are 95 percent or more affordable housing unit projects.

So once again, the overarching point

there is that I think the information that's provided in the MAPC data is in line with the recommendation or that range that we're coming up with of, you know, trying to justify a lower range in the range of .4 to .6, compared to the .2 that's proposed for this project.

So that's it from a demand perspective. There was also a number of comments that we had in our original review related to some geometrics from a zoning perspective. The architect, Cube 3, responded to all of our items. We take no exception to anything they said. They did a good job explaining it and, you know, basically resolved any of the questions we had, so really nothing that I think we need to present to the board at this time. You know, like I said, we take no exception to those comments.

The only last piece I will mention is that to achieve the six spaces, they are using a semiautomated system, the puzzle parking system. I believe this board has seen this on a couple of projects now. We at Walker take no exception to this technology. We recommend this to our

clients. This is an appropriate type use for it where you have a small footprint, and you're trying to, you know, densify or get as much parking into that as you can. So no issue or -- you know, we take no exception to the use of these puzzle systems.

MR. GELLER: Thank you. Anything else, Brandon?

MR. SCHRENKER: That's it.

MR. GELLER: Great. Thank you. Board members, questions? Let's start with Kate. I see you shaking your head, Johanna. Well, you'll have to wait.

MS. POVERMAN: So thank you, Mr. Geller. Mr. Schrenker, is it -- when you refer to this area being in the transit overlay district, my understanding of that term means that the zoning requirements for the amount of parking required are, in fact, reduced in relation to other zoning requirements in Brookline. Is that the case?

MR. SCHRENKER: My understanding for this location would be that the retail becomes a maximum instead of a minimum, but as far as the

base ratios, my understanding is that they are not reduced.

MS. POVERMAN: One of the reasons that the applicants give for low number of parking spaces provided in relation to the retail is that it's going to be a -- most people will be walking to it, and they cited, for example, a drycleaner. But in terms of a café, which they now refer to, is that something which is generally categorized as a destination that people would walk to without needing parking, or is it all fungible?

MR. SCHRENKER: I think it can be, particularly given the size. We're talking like 1700 square feet. It's a relatively small footprint, so it will be less of a destination to drive to, and yes, more of -- you're going to walk there, and if it's a café, get your coffee, get your, you know, scone or whatever, and it's not going to generate that much parking demand.

MS. POVERMAN: That's all I have for now. Thank you.

MR. SCHRENKER: Sure.

MR. GELLER: Johanna?

MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Hi, Brandon. Thank you very much for your comments. I just have a couple of questions. I mean, obviously, the concern that we, as a board, I think, would have about this project not providing sufficient parking is where would the cars go, right.

So we're building -- you know, let's say we're building a project with a .2 ratio, you know, there is a part of me that says, well, that's a marketing issue or a marketability issue for the developer. But I think the concern that we're trying to manage from the town's perspective is people are going to -- there will be people who come with cars anyway.

MR. SCHRENKER: Um-hmm.

MS. SCHNEIDER: So what are the available resources for people who bring cars with them who live in this property and don't have enough parking for their cars? Where will they park, and what is -- what's the impact about on sort of the overall parking ecosystem of the neighborhood?

MR. SCHRENKER: Sure. So what

typically happens -- and I say this anecdotally, because a co-worker has a friend that lives in this area -- is they'll look for supplies elsewhere where someone is renting spaces.

So someone that has extra spaces, for instance, in Brighton or somewhere like that, they will -- you know, they'll park their car there, and they just may not use it as often. It's more that they store it and then use it when they need it, for instance, on the weekends or otherwise, and then find, you know, another mode for their more normal parking -- or more normal transit, whether it's going to work or something like that.

MS. SCHNEIDER: And do you have a sense as to whether or not there is adequate supply of rental parking spaces if people who live in this development but can't park at the project bring a car, and they want to park someplace else in the neighborhood, are there spaces even available for people to do that?

MR. SCHRENKER: I don't have a feel for that, unfortunately. I do know, you know, obviously, within Brookline itself that there is

a waiting list for the overnight lots, and so that capacity is no longer there, you know, and then it's a question of -- there would need to be a study to see what the capacity is elsewhere, who's renting spaces, what's available. But I don't have a feel for that in this vicinity, no.

MS. SCHNEIDER: Okay.

MR. GELLER: Kate, hold on. Let Johanna finish.

MS. POVERMAN: Okay, but I want to speak a duet with her sometime later on. I'll hold on.

MS. SCHNEIDER: My other question, Brandon, had to do with the census track data that you were showing us, you know, both for this portion of Brookline, but then also kind of down Comm. Ave in Allston-Brighton. And my question is I'm assuming that that's 2010 census data, because we're obviously collecting your data for the 2020 census now.

Do you feel like there has been any sort of shift in parking or car ownership or demand in the last ten years that aren't reflected -- you know, because we don't have the

updated 2020 data, would you expect those numbers to change at all, or for there to be lower parking demand, even in those areas, you know, that you're showing, you know, the adjacent tracks because of demographic shifts or, you know, preferential shifts of people over the last ten years? I may not have asked that clearly, but I think you know what I mean.

MR. SCHRENKER: What we've heard from some of our clients is that they are seeing some reductions in parking, you know, and these are some of the larger garages in Boston. So I do suspect -- you know, I'm guessing, but I do suspect that we will see demand decrease to some extent in the next census information. To what extent, I don't have a number, I can't put a figure on it. But overall, with more people using, you know, ride share, Uber or Lyft, those sorts of systems, there is that.

In the longer term, once autonomous vehicles become more, you know, readily available, there will be a shift, but we're just not there yet, and that obviously wouldn't be reflected in the -- you know, in any upcoming

data. That's going to take a long time. We're probably ten-plus years away from that realistically impacting demand. But yes, I would expect that we will see some decrease in the next census data that comes out, but I don't -- you know, to put a number on it, I don't know what that might be.

MS. SCHNEIDER: But you think that industry trends and demographic trends are suggesting that it will at least dip a little bit below that, you know, .59 to .92 ratio that you gave us as the current range based on the 2010 data?

MR. SCHRENKER: I think so. I mean, the important piece -- and I don't know the exact timing on the MAPC data, but that report, I believe, was done in the last couple of years. So, you know, the .58 that we're seeing, the .5 -- or .78 and that 3.9 that I noted, you know, that's data that they collected within the last couple of years. So while there may be some dips in some of the census data, that's relatively recent information.

MS. SCHNEIDER: And my last question,

and I'm sure everybody asks this -- I know it's way premature -- but, you know, is I'm sure people in your industry are talking about whether or not the current pandemic is going to have any impact on parking demand. Do you have any opinion about that or do you know what -- what are you advising people?

MR. SCHRENKER: Sure. So as a company, we are studying this. Similar to Jim, we don't have the answer yet. What we speculate is there's people that worry about what they're calling carmageddon, which is this idea that everyone is going to drive, and no one is going to take public transportation anymore.

The flip side of that is we're all learning that we can work from home and be effective at it, or most people can, you know, to some extent. So while more people may be driving in their cars, some people may be only working three days a week in Boston, where they used to work, you know, all five days, or some people may go fully remote.

There will be this transition time where we're going to learn what happens, and

then at some point, we'll ramp back up, we think, to what it once was. The piece that we look back to is after 9/11 and how long it took for the airlines really to get back up to speed, and that's what we foresee being, you know, once a vaccine or whatever, you know, gets us to the point where people start to be comfortable again that things will ramp back up then, but there will be this odd in between time where, you know, parking demand will be in flux. We're studying it, and we get asked this by all of our clients, and unfortunately, we don't have a good answer yet.

MS. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

MR. SCHRENKER: Sure.

MR. GELLER: Kate?

MS. POVERMAN: So I was wondering if there was actually any data available in Brookline relating to the amount of or percentage of parking that was used in apartment buildings. So we know how many parking spaces are provided. The question is to what extent are they being used.

So, for example, the Daneshes have a

building across the street from the current project, basically, and I'm wondering -- I guess that was the one with -- let me see my numbers -- what's that, 17 units? I'm sorry. I should have it at my fingertips, but I'm wondering what their experience has been so far, because I understand the building is full, in terms of what the demand for parking has been, if one of the Daneshes could comment on that.

MS. MORELLI: Victor, could you promote Danny Danesh, please?

MR. DANESH: This is Danny Danesh. Can you hear me?

MS. POVERMAN: Yeah.

MR. DANESH: Hi. How are you? I don't have the exact number of how many parking spaces are being occupied at the moment, but we can get that information for you. It hasn't been, you know, a tremendous amount. We haven't had any issues.

MS. POVERMAN: A prospective tenant I know was told that there was no parking, but she did park across the street in the gas station lot, which as we all know, is being developed.

Are you aware of anyone being told anything similar?

MR. DANESH: The gas station lot?

MS. POVERMAN: Yes, Shimon's.

MR. DANESH: I don't know anything about Shimon's gas station lot and parking there.

MS. POVERMAN: But to your knowledge, has everybody been able to get parking who wants parking in that most recent development?

MR. DANESH: Yes. I mean, the building is not really stabilized yet. You know, we just finished a few months ago. So it takes time to stabilize the building.

MS. POVERMAN: I'm not sure what you mean by that.

MR. DANESH: So when a building is first completed, it takes a year or two for all the units to get leased up. Sometimes you offer, you know, concessions to get the building leased, things are -- people are doing construction still sometimes to get -- you know, to finish up the building. So it's only been a few months since we finished. So I don't have

the exact -- I don't have a number of parking spaces, you know, off the top of my head, but we can get that information for you. I can tell you there's no parking at that Shimon's gas station.

MS. POVERMAN: I know, which is why I was curious. That person who gave me this information told me that, but she also said that you were fully rented out, which I thought was fantastic. So if you could get that information for us by next week in terms of amount rented and what the parking space demand is, that would be great.

MR. DANESH: Sure. No problem.

MS. POVERMAN: I'm all through for now. Thank you.

MR. GELLER: Great. Randolph?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: This is a question for Mr. Schrenker. Is there information about the parking ecosystem in Boston, and what I mean, specifically, is, you know, it says in one of the peer review reports or the comments that this property is only 1,000 feet from the municipal boundary. One of your slides showed that, you know, it's an overwhelmingly sort of

rental apartment neighborhood.

But, you know, I haven't lived in Boston. I don't know what the permitting situation is for parking on the street, nor what enforcement is like. And I guess the point of the question is, you know, are -- is the permitting so different or the enforcement so lax that it becomes practicable to some extent for, you know, an occupant of this proposed development at 500 Harvard to sort of take their chances and find a space, you know, on the street or, you know, register their car at somebody else's address in Boston? I don't know if this is going too far into what ifs, but what's it like in Boston?

MR. SCHRENKER: So I can speak from my personal experience. So I did live in Brighton, and I also lived in South Boston. I didn't own a car, but people I was with would own a car, and so they are -- they do enforce well. So whether it's street cleaning or if you do not have a permit, you will be towed.

So, you know, I think it's unlikely that someone living in Brookline would park on a

street, say, you know, further up in Allston-Brighton, because they would be -- you know, they would be taking a risk of, you know, the enforcement.

So that's what I can offer. I don't know too much else about their policy or how often they patrol or elsewhat, but I think that someone that was -- did want a car that was unable to get it at this location would most likely be looking for a parking lot where they could pay and park, as opposed to trying to put it on the street in Boston, as opposed to Brookline.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: And that lot could be really in either municipality?

MR. SCHRENKER: Or private, yeah. It's a private arrangement.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Thank you.

MR. GELLER: Is that it, Randolph? All of my questions have been answered, frankly. So Brandon, thank you very much.

MR. SCHRENKER: Thank you.

MR. GELLER: We may have need of you in the future, but that's it for this evening.

MR. SCHRENKER: Sure. Thank you.

MR. GELLER: Great. Does the applicant want to respond to any of peer review comments, questions that have been raised to this point?

MS. MORELLI: Victor, could we also promote Jennifer Dopazo-Gilbert, please? Thank you.

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: Thank you. Thank you so much. Good evening, everyone. I'm Jennifer Dopazo-Gilbert, here for the applicant. Just a couple of things before I turn it over to our consultant, Scott Thornton, to briefly respond to some of the comments.

I didn't hear at the beginning of the meeting, Maria, but I'm going to assume that all of the support letters that were submitted from Brookline for everyone from Mark Drayson at MAPC, and I believe there were several others that came in in support of the project. So I just want to make sure that the board got all of those.

MS. MORELLI: Yes.

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: Great. And, you

know, Monday evening, we went to the transportation board and met with the board for almost two hours, and they provided you with a full report with over a dozen recommendations, including various mitigation.

And I am pleased to report that I've met with our team, and we will be happy to implement those recommendations. Many of them were also made by the peer reviewers. So you got that, and if you haven't seen it, it's pretty extensive.

There is, of course, a cost impact, especially with respect to the design and construction recommended by the town of the ADA sidewalk ramps and reducing the curbs at the crosswalks, etcetera, etcetera. I won't read it to you, you have it, but I'm very happy to report that though all of those mitigation recommendations and the other recommendations that were made by the transportation board and Todd Kirrane are acceptable. So I wanted to let the board know that, lest they have any questions or concerns about that.

With respect to the site distance,

that was also addressed by the transportation board in their mitigation recommendations. And Johanna, you had asked, you know, where would be the best place for the loading zone. Well, the transportation board has recommenced a 40-foot loading zone on Harvard Street, not limited to the morning hours, and we think that that will certainly assist with all of the ride shares, the UPS and Amazon vans that may be servicing this building.

With respect to the turning onto Kenwood and the, I think I heard several times, frustrated drivers, you know, these folks are going to also be part of the neighborhood, so if -- and I also want to note that it's not just the folks turning out of this building, the six or seven spaces that would be going down Kenwood to go to work or what have you to go out -- Kenwood also uses it, but so does Verndale, and so does the other neighboring street, because those are all one-ways there. So it's my understanding that for the folks to get to their homes on Verndale, they go down Kenwood, as well, and then turn up Verndale. So I just wanted to

mention that.

Also, next door to this proposed site, there's a 16-unit condo building that has no parking. And with respect to the MAPC recommendation, they strongly support the project, and they have found, based on their research and data, that the seven spaces would be adequate.

They also noted -- it wasn't mentioned by the peer reviewer -- that in their opinion, expanding or increasing the parking does not reduce traffic, and that in their experience, it encourages more car ownership and then resulting increase in traffic. But I do want Scott Thornton to go over some of the highlights, which I think there's a lot of agreement between the peer reviewers, and we really didn't hear a lot about that.

So Scott, I'd like to turn it over to you. Victor, if you could promote Scott Thornton so he could just go over any comments and provide some feedback on whatever he heard from the peer reviewers this evening. So thank you very much.

MR. THORNTON: Can you hear me? Excellent. Thank you. Scott Thornton with Vanasse & Associates, traffic consultant for the project, and thank you for that lead in, Jennifer.

We did receive the peer review comments from Environmental Partners and from Walker last week, and we can provide a detailed response to those letters. In terms of responding to some of the items tonight, I think Jennifer is right. We did have consensus on several of the issues. I think that there's --

You know, in terms of traffic volumes that were collected, in terms of the background projects that were studied, in terms of the trip generation that we conducted, trip generation calculations for the project to be conducted, I think there was consensus there.

What's interesting with the trip generation is that, you know, on the one hand, I understand what Jim is saying about the -- you know, relying on the trip generation data and calculations. That is the -- it's pretty standard. It's a cut and dry process. You know,

with the type of developments such as this, the number of units, according to the ITE, is directly related to the number of trips.

And lately, the ITE has started to bring in some of the modal choice questions and aspects of trip generation, because it's not just vehicle trips, it's person trips, and that includes transit and bicycling and pedestrian modes, as well, but they're not quite there yet. So that's why we look at the -- at data from the most recent American commuter survey, which did indicate that in this area, about 68 percent of trips are made by other modes than vehicles.

So it's really only about 32 percent of trips, based on the residents that are in this area, and I believe this is from 2014 to 2018. So it's fairly recent data, but it's probably still -- you know, those numbers have probably continued -- the vehicle use percentage has probably continued to decrease, you know, up until earlier this year with Covid.

So, you know, we're -- so we're kind of doing a mix of using what we have and using what we know. We're also relying on, you know,

sort of trends in areas that are served by transit really well. So Boston, and so Cambridge, those types of areas that are -- that have good transit coverage are naturally going to have less need for vehicles and less need for parking.

And where we're about three or four minutes from the B branch of the Green Line, and we have a bus that runs right past the site and stops right at the corner of Verndale Street, we think that -- you know, that just reinforces the reduced need for parking for this site.

In terms of -- you know, I did want to correct Jim on the daily trip generation. I think he mentioned that there's 128 vehicles. That's actually 128 vehicle trips on a daily basis, so it's a total of about 64 vehicles, again, based on that conservative ITE data.

With regards to the curb cuts on Harvard versus Kenwood Street, you know, we think that it's not just the -- we think that the Kenwood Street curb cut is a better choice to serve as access for the project.

The Harvard Street curb cut, while we

understand that there's -- you know, there's the potential for vehicles to come in and out of that location, we don't think that's a good idea. We think that there's -- you know, in addition to the pedestrians and the bicyclists and the bus conflicts that are going to be there, there's still the vehicle traffic that's going to -- that's on Harvard Street, and there's --

You know, we did look at crash history out there. There isn't really -- there's no record of any crashes in the area, but we think that just introducing another curb cut is -- you know, for traffic to go through is just not the best choice here.

We think that moving the vehicles to Kenwood Street, while it is true that there's, you know, that -- those vehicles would have to circulate through to Verndale or to Russell Street to exit back out to Harvard, you know, that -- we're talking about the vehicle trips from six parking spaces, so -- and again, that's where that disconnect between the reality of the number of vehicles that will be parking at the site and the ITE trip generation exists.

In terms of the site distance and the number of observations for the speed data, you know, we conducted 80 observations over the course of two hours. Our standard is 40 observations. We did not -- I'll be honest, we did not do the full analysis to identify what the confidence interval should be for the requisite number of observations.

But again, this is our standard. And in the interests of time to get the response back, we had people go out there to get the observations through the radar gun. An ATR would have taken -- which is a tube that would get installed on Kenwood Street, would have taken additional time, probably another week, to install, get that data back, break it down, and so forth.

In addition, we think that the operative speed to capture there is, as Jim mentioned, the speed for the vehicle as they're entering Kenwood Street. An ATR at that location would not capture that speed data. Because of the vehicle turning, there's friction that's involved running over a tube, so it tends

to distort the readings.

As it is, we captured, you know -- the ATR doesn't capture speeds much lower than ten miles an hour either. So the majority of the speeds that we captured were in the 13 mile per hour and lower speed -- actually, it was much lower than that. But, you know, we think that it's still a conservative approach, and we feel confident that adequate site distance is going to be provided.

In terms of the parking on Kenwood Street, we had no issues. We always said that it was at the town's discretion as to whether or not they wanted to prohibit parking in that stretch between Harvard Street and the site driveway.

And a couple of other things that came up. I think Ms. Poverman mentioned the other units -- or the other developments. 455 and 420 Harvard Street had different trip generation. You know, I don't have those studies in front of me. I can take a look at those. It could be a difference in the adjustments for the census tract or for the mode split. But again, these are things that were reviewed by Jim during the

peer review process for those developments.

I think in terms of the parking, you know, I would note -- I mean, we have the same question that Ms. Schneider had related to the census data and how, you know, it's somewhat dated, and it doesn't reflect the trends that have been occurring in the last maybe ten years now.

And some of the -- you know, the general -- if you look at the activities to reduce congestion in these -- in the Greater Boston area, a lot of it is focused on reducing parking and -- with the idea being that with fewer parking spaces, you have fewer cars, you have fewer people with cars, less car ownership, and more alternative transportation use, particularly given the greater emphasis on climate change and reduction, greenhouse gases. There's a bigger social awareness of this now, and I think that is also contributing to the trend towards reduced parking.

In terms of the MAPC data that Mr. Schrenker had just flashed up on the screen, I did notice that while there -- while it's true

that the average of parking spaces seem to be -- or the provision rates seem to be around in the .4 to .5 range, there were also 16 data points that were .2 spaces per unit and less.

And also, looking at that map, some of the data included Greater Boston and included -- there were a number of apartment developments that were on 93 and that were -- looked to be on Route 9, and, you know, these are low -- these are -- it's great to have that data, and I'm sure that those were the sites that they could get access to to do those counts. But at the same time, those areas don't have the same type of transit capability or transit availability that this site has.

So it's -- you know, it's a little -- I think the data -- even at those locations that are so removed from transit, they're still showing a reduced need for parking, and really an abundance of parking that's not getting used, and that's just wasted space. It's wasted impacts to -- in areas for runoff, and, you know, it's spaces that could be used for additional units to provide more housing.

So I think that's really sort of a response to the -- or a high level response to the comments that we've heard tonight, and again, we'll be providing some detailed responses to the two comment letters that were received on Friday.

MR. GELLER: Thank you.

MS. POVERMAN: May I ask a question?

MR. GELLER: Go ahead, Kate.

MS. POVERMAN: Mr. Thornton, you were referring to the data showing that there were parking spaces going unused that could be space better used for other things and referred to some buildings near 93 and Route 9. Do you have any information on any development in Brookline where the parking is not fully utilized?

MR. THORNTON: I do not. We do have the -- we posted the list of the developments that were in Brookline where reduced parking was present -- or limited parking spaces -- limited number of parking spaces were provided, but I don't have specific data on parking use and availability in Brookline.

MS. POVERMAN: And as Mr. Fitzgerald

pointed out, maybe four of those places you refer to the addresses were built in 1890 and 1915; isn't that correct?

MR. THORNTON: That's true, but they're still being rented. So I think that there -- you know, there's still a demand and a market for rental units where the tenants don't have vehicles and for units without parking.

MS. POVERMAN: Thank you.

MR. GELLER: Anything else? Randolph?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: No.

MR. GELLER: Great. Thank you.

MR. THORNTON: Thank you.

MR. GELLER: We're now going to call on members of the public to offer their testimony and comments. Start by giving us your name and address, and please speak to the topics that were raised this evening. Victor is going to promote people in cue.

MR. PANAK: Richard Lanza, you're the first person in the list of public speakers. Please confirm your name and your address.

MS. MORELLI: Mr. Lanza, if you could unmute, please.

MR. LANZA: Yeah, that should do it, I think. Is that okay?

MS. MORELLI: Thank you.

MR. LANZA: Yes, thank you very much. I'm Richard Lanza. I live at 57 Kenwood Street. I am the -- I must say, just because everyone is here, I was quite impressed by the fact that I had written many, many notes as to what I thought were issues, and I think both of -- all the previous speakers really did address most of them.

But I had two areas which I want you to think about. One is sort of the lower priority, perhaps, and that is the issue of traffic. And the question is when does one measure the traffic flow. I noticed it was done in July, and, of course, I think the traffic I could observe on many streets was quite a bit lower during the summer, an unusual situation, I might add. So I wonder about those numbers.

With respect to going down Kenwood Street, I think Mr. Meiklejohn pointed out that historically, the end of Columbia Street was blocked off, which cut off the cut-throughs from

Harvard Street onto Commonwealth Avenue. That was around 1981 or so.

But there are problems there, though. Cars going down Kenwood Street tend to accelerate. There's a slight downhill, but we do have two speed bumps that seem to have slowed things considerably, but it's right in front of -- I might point out it's right in front of a rather active playground, which is another issue to worry about. So that's one question about the traffic.

My real concern, by the way, was primarily on the issue of parking, and the number of six. I could not do the surveys that were done professionally, obviously, but what I did do was walk down Brainerd Road, which, as you know, consists of a whole bunch of apartment houses, most of which are not six stories high, I don't believe, have considerably more units, but most of them have rather large indoor parking garages, not mechanical ones, I might add.

So their numbers, I suspect, are higher than .2 spaces per unit. And my question is when I go down that street, I notice it's

always parked up, absolutely always parked up. There's not enough parking, and obviously, people are not too excited about spending $150 a month more to park, because the parking situation for commercial parking is rather difficult.

So that was one of my concerns, and I just did not understand -- honestly, I did not understand the arguments that people shouldn't drive cars -- I hear that is a great argument -- and yes, I believe that is the case. We should probably not be driving cars in the city. We should have great efficient mass transportation, but people don't always do it.

And I would say that -- I had heard one -- I believe one of the principals at one of the meetings at the site say something to the effect that millenials don't drive cars, and therefore, they didn't need space. I really -- I find I have a disagreement with one of the consultants here. I just don't see where the numbers came up, the reference for how many people really do use cars.

And I understand MAPC's desires, which

is -- MAPC, of course, wants to cut down on the number of cars, and so they use numbers and say let's just have fewer cars, and, you know, that would be great, perhaps, but perhaps not because there are people who do need cars.

So my major concern is I think the parking estimate of only six units strikes me as being rather optimistic, because my suspicions are -- and again, I can't prove this. My suspicions are that what will happen is people will park on Kenwood Street, and that simply is going to be where people will park, and, of course, that's going to present problems on Kenwood Street. So I wonder about that.

I also wonder a little bit -- and again, I was explained clearly the notion of mechanical parking. And I think one of the problems, of course, with any mechanical system is one has to distinguish between the average rate which you can get cars through, which comes up to a pretty big number per day, and how many you get off per hour when everyone is heading off someplace at 8:00 in the morning, and I suspect those numbers will be considerably lower. There

will be jams at the parking systems.

And perhaps one of the parking people could, I guess, from the -- I guess Walker, perhaps, could -- not Walker -- oops, sorry, wrong consultant. I guess the EP was the ones who looked at the parking. But I just wonder has anyone done any work to find out what the average cueing time is between 7:00 and 9:00 in the morning, because that's when you get trouble. If I average it out over the day, it would be easy. But I can imagine the winter, and I can imagine things getting rather jammed up there.

So I think that's my notes, and again, congratulations, folks. You've obviously done a great job working out a lot of details. But I think the concern I suspect of almost all the neighbors on Kenwood Street really will be the notion that we're going to have cars parked at Latham (?) Street, and I think that is a concern. Even though I know it's illegal, and you can't park for more than two hours, I can guarantee you that people will be parking on the street. Thank you.

By the way, I might add one other

comment. We live right in front of the tennis court, which is down -- about halfway down Kenwood, and there's a lot of people crossing over. There's kids going back and forth between the street, pets, dogs, cats. It's a relatively more -- I think there's probably more cross traffic across the street than there is down the street. We had a cat killed, also, but another story.

MR. BIERNBAUM: Hello. I am Lee Biernbaum. I live at 7 Verndale Street. Hopefully everyone can see and hear me. Zoom, very surprisingly, kicks you out and rejoins you when this happens, so I just want to make sure everything is working correctly. Yes, okay.

MS. MORELLI: Yes.

MR. BIERNBAUM: So thank you all very much for the opportunity to speak. I'm really looking forward to getting the opportunity to welcome a bunch of new neighbors to the neighborhood. It's going to be exciting to get to see a lot of people move in.

Quickly, I just want to first of all state that I cannot possibly be more in favor of

a loading zone. I know they're not particularly common in Brookline, and we have a huge need for a curb management and loading zone program across the whole town. So I'd be very happy to see it start right here, basically across the street. I should note 7 Verndale Street is right at the intersection of Harvard and Verndale. This is literally right in my front yard, and I cannot be happier to see more housing being built.

More specifically, I was a little surprised to hear the dismissal of comparables from buildings that are 100 years old. Comparables from 100 years ago are, in fact, exactly what we need. This is what the neighborhood is. The built environment from 100 -- in the case of my building, 130 years ago is a huge percentage of the housing stock around here.

It created the town that we have chosen to move to, that we love, we want more of. And these units, I think as someone said before, remain in extreme demand. Given the price that units are selling in my building now, I can tell

you that there's massive demand for these very old buildings, including ones with very little parking.

This is the -- these buildings are the neighborhood character. This is exactly what we're looking to preserve out of all of this. This is the Brookline.

Beyond that, the discussion on parking utilization numbers, I think it was just worth noting that those are based on places that have parking, which means that they're attracting people who want to have a place to park their car, but we don't have to choose that. We can -- we have a choice about what this neighborhood will be and what we're going to build. And if we have the choice between a car dominated neighborhood and a people dominated neighborhood, like why would we choose the car one?

Personally, I mean, so my family and I, as I said, we live across the street. We have two school age children. They were babies in this apartment, they were toddlers in this apartment, and we've done it all from day one car

free. We take the bus, we take the train, we walk, we scoot, and yes, the occasional zip car and ride hail. But it's a great place to live, and it's a great place to live car free. The ability to do that in exactly this place is why we are here, and we're not the only people looking to do that.

So I want more people like this. I want more people who can do this. And let's not ignore, finally here, the tradeoff that's at play. A choice to build more parking here means building fewer units or more expensive units in a place that's already very expensive.

That is a very real cost of the decision here. We need more housing in Brookline. We need more market rate housing. We need more low income housing. A choice for more parking means a choice to have less housing here and less low income housing here. Thank you.

MR. GELLER: Thank you.

MS. MORELLI: Please unmute Vitaly. Thank you.

MR. VEKSLER: Sorry. Thank you very much for your time, and I really appreciate your

thoughts about this project and your consideration of different details. I am talking in the opposition to this project for several reasons.

The biggest one of them -- I agree with Richard Lanza, who spoke before me. Well, he talked about parking. But for me, the biggest concern is the increased probability of a crash or an accident, and I'll tell you, I see -- now I work from home, and every day, I see cars driving in the wrong direction on Kenwood Street, every single day, with no exceptions.

This project would dramatically increase the number of cars that drive in the wrong direction, or how should I say loitering at the entrance to Kenwood Street. There would be multiple, multiple vehicles there, and when you try to turn into Kenwood, it's a very difficult turn. Left turn is very -- I mean sometimes it's challenging, right, and these vehicles, some of them would be backing out, right, because as somebody mentioned, in order not to break the law, in order not to go in the wrong direction, you know, some service vehicles

such as Ubers and such as FedEx, they will be backing out, and that's what increases the probability of a problem, of an accident.

My friend was killed when she was riding on a one-way street by a driver who was driving in the wrong direction. She was a student, she was a graduate student, and my graduate school endowed a scholarship in her honor.

The reason I'm mentioning it, we have a lot of not only graduate students here, we have a lot of kids who come to this street, to our park, Columbia Park, to -- or Kenwood Park, whatever it's called, not only from Brookline, but from many different locations, and sometimes they get into these streets, and they don't expect drivers to go in the wrong direction, and that's when the -- I mean, these unfortunate accidents may happen.

And as Mr. Randolph Meiklejohn mentioned in his comments, this project brings a number of people who would not even live here -- they would not live in the 500 Harvard Street building, but people servicing them. They don't

know this neighborhood, and we -- sometimes you see people, you know, from FedEx or UPS speeding on our street, on Kenwood, and I assume on other streets in the neighborhood. I see them on Kenwood from my window. So this is a danger.

Obviously, the building would reduce the visibility of when you turn right from Harvard Street. This restaurant or whatever they are planning to put there, it would be straight to the corner, right. And now, we can see what's happening on Kenwood, at the beginning of Kenwood, and a number of -- actually, one time I saw that the car was moving in the wrong direction, and that's how I braked right before kind of hitting this car. So that's -- you know, unfortunately, that would create a problem.

And another one is these buildings are similar -- or the building that is proposed is similar to buildings from Brainerd Street. If you want comparisons in our area, Brainerd is in Allston. You probably know they have a couple of new buildings. And often, I drive there, you know, bringing my kids from their activities in

the evening, and on a number of occasions, I saw that vehicles were double parked, not one, not two, sometimes three, sometimes four vehicles, and you have to be very brave to go around four vehicles on the wrong side of the road or wait there for a while.

So the reason I'm bringing this, the developers said that they want to have one place, one spot, for all kinds of Uber, UPS and FedEx cars or trucks parking there. They just have one spot. It will not be enough, this spot. You know, during the delivery times, sometimes you can't predict when it happens, but it happens -- on Brainerd, it happens in the evening often when you have -- you know, when people are going out, it's, you know, around 9:00.

There are four cars, you know, four Uber cars, and they are not moving. They're waiting for people to show up, and this is a danger. It creates a danger, and when you have it on Harvard, you will be going against traffic on Harvard. So it's a face to face collision. It creates this opportunity of a face to face

collision that didn't exist before.

And one last one. This building is so huge, it doubles the population of Kenwood Street. It has 30 units. We have 23 houses here. So when you have a massive -- I don't know, a cruise ship like in Venice, you put -- you know, people in Venice are very unhappy with these cruise ships, you know, that get into canals that are not big enough for buildings. And that's my analogy of what this building is. I appreciate your time, and thank you for listening to me.

MS. MORELLI: Victor, the next person slated to speak is --

MR. PANAK: Anna Kolodner, and I've promoted you to a panelist, and you can turn on your microphone and your video, if you'd like. Give us your name and your address. Then you can deliver your comments.

MS. KOLODNER: Hello. Thank you for allowing me to speak. So I think there -- obviously, in all of these projects, there's many opportunities for compromise. I don't feel that we can compromise on the safety of our

children.

In addition to deliveries and all the service people that come to this building, there is also numbers of visitors. And having lived on Columbia Street for 28 years, the traffic is particularly interesting. When people come down Kenwood Street, they can either go back up Russell, or they can come down Columbia Street. And my experience is when they hit Columbia Street, they've already been on the road longer than they want to, and they tend to speed up. So people fly from -- after they've made the turn down Columbia Street. So I think that's really a very big issue. Perhaps speed bumps would mitigate that somewhat, but I doubt it.

The trend in our neighborhood is to have less single-family houses and more two-family houses, as the houses are being turned into two-families, which has necessitated, you know, whether you want to have cars or not, there are more cars.

So one of the issues is that most of the driveways are single lane driveways. So when you have two apartments full of people, you

have to park in tandem. So on Columbia Street in the morning, it's virtually -- almost impossible many days to pull your car out and find a space to park it temporarily while you pull the other cars out. So I think parking is a very serious issue.

We've also not talked about the impact of that we have the Chabad House and Levine's, and because in the last six months, things there have perhaps been slowed down, and there haven't been as many people, I submitted something in writing previously after I met with Levine's about the number of funerals they have every year, and on a funeral day, there is no parking on Columbia Street whatsoever. The street is fully, fully parked, all the way down and around the block.

Some people have said there was parking potentially available at Shimon's. Well, Shimon's parking is also going to disappear, because that's going to be developed.

I'm a little bit concerned about -- in two of the presentations, and I apologize because I don't -- I didn't write down

everyone's names. A couple of times, I heard there was not a full analysis for time. We didn't do a 24-hour sample. I'm not clear on why that has to be. We've had plenty of time to do more than full analyses, and given the time that -- you know right now, there's -- I just don't think it's a realistic -- the samples that are taken are realistic, given that -- given in Covid, everybody's traffic patterns and everybody's lives are very different.

Another issue that I want to bring up is once this project starts, where will the contractors park, and when will -- and where will the construction material delivery trucks park. So I think there has to be some attention to mitigation of that issue.

In addition to that, many people are aware of the fact that commercial tenants on Harvard Street now have the right to park on our streets. So we have commercial tenants, owners or tenants of the commercial properties on Harvard Street parking on Columbia Street. Whether they're parking on other streets, I don't know yet, but they're certainly parking on

Columbia Street.

I really don't understand if the choice is to compromise, why not compromise in favor of the children, the many, many children who come from all the neighborhoods around but the four streets that surround the park who are crossing that street constantly. Why not put the entrance on Harvard Street and not have to deal with all of that? Why take that risk? Why not protect the children?

And I, too, having friends on Kenwood Street, etcetera, have seen many, many cars take that illegal turn, and they don't want to go around the block, and they pull out the wrong way, and I think that's a serious concern.

I don't want to reiterate too much of what other people said, but I also feel that one loading zone is not adequate for all of the deliveries, all of the services, and the number of people that are likely to be -- if you don't want cars that are likely to be taking Lyfts and Ubers, etcetera. So thank you very much. I appreciate your time.

MR. PANAK: The next public speaker is

Patricia Pierce, although I believe the speaker himself is Brad Reich. Brad, you can turn on your microphone and your video, if you'd like, and then give us your name and address.

MR. REICH: Hi. I'm Brad Reich from 32 Verndale Street. Thank you for letting me speak. I guess I have one overall question, which is -- and it may not be answerable. Given the increased density on Harvard over the last year or two, has there been any study of how much more congestion, traffic wise, there has been. Because my concern is that this is just going to further trend toward congesting Harvard Street. So if any of the consultants could answer that question.

MS. MORELLI: I think we would have to -- one thing I can say -- this is Maria Morelli from the planning department. I believe when we do have traffic studies done, they do take into account prospective projects in the area. So I can say that in general, we usually give -- any firm that is doing a traffic study, we will give them a list of prospective developments with the number of units in the -- in parking spaces in

the area. So they should be taken into account.

MR. REICH: So the committee is aware of that information in making their decision?

MS. MORELLI: You can confirm with our consultants if VAI had taken into account the prospective developments in the area, but I can tell you that when we do have people doing studies and looking at a scope, we will give them a list of developments, prospective developments in the area.

MS. POVERMAN: Maria, in the analyses we're given, aren't we given no build and build analyses of what the traffic would be if the particular project were built and (lost connection) in the pipeline in the area. So would that be sufficient analysis for Mr. Reich?

MS. MORELLI: And generally, that's done. I'm just -- I didn't want to speak for any consultants who are present and wanted to verify what was done in this case. Can we just promote Mr. Fitzgerald, please, Victor?

MR. PANAK: Sure. Do you want me to promote Mr. Thornton, too?

MS. MORELLI: Sure.

MR. FITZGERALD: You know, just to chime in, as you were both mentioning, yes, we -- as part of the typical protocol for analyzing the impacts of the site, the applicant -- in this case, VAI is the engineer for the applicant -- looks at the future traffic volumes assuming all the other developments into play.

Scott, I don't know if you want to chime in here, but it's really a comparison of how the net -- how the studied intersections would operate with or without the subject development in play as a comparison to see what the impacts of that site would be at that intersection, specifically.

MR. THORNTON: Yeah, absolutely, Jim, and there were five developments that the planning department recommended that we include in the traffic analysis, in addition to the subject parcel. So those were included for congestion -- or for analysis of congestion in the area.

MR. REICH: Thank you. I think you've answered my question.

MR. THORNTON: You're welcome.

MR. PANAK: The next public speaker is Matti Klock. Matti, please turn on your microphone and your video, if you'd like, give us your name and your address, and then you can deliver your comment.

MS. KLOCK: Hi. My name is Matti Klock. My address is 5 Verndale, Unit 4. And I'm looking forward to this project being developed and looking forward to a lot of new people with fewer cars, and also retail space.

I want to cast a vote for putting the driveway on Kenwood, if possible. It does involve winding through the neighborhoods, but motorists are in a climate controlled living room, and the street frontage is used by everyone, including pedestrians -- I walk kids by there a lot on their way to get to school -- and it's also a very active bus stop. And given that we're trying to encourage folks to use transit, getting the driveway out of the way of the bus stop people seems like a good plan.

I also want to note that I am a little bit confused by the concerns about safety due to lack of parking. In my experience, Brookline is

ruthless about parking enforcement, which is great. I don't think that they're going to put their cars on the roads. I think they're just going to not have cars, and I think this is a great way to bring in new people without increasing congestion. So those are my comments. Thank you.

MR. PANAK: The next speaker is Susie Davidson. Susie, you can now turn on your microphone and your video, if you'd like, give us your name and address, and then you can deliver your comment.

MS. DAVIDSON: Hi. So I am an owner next door at 516 Harvard Street. First of all, I missed the (no volume).

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: We don't have a predicted start date to provide you. We're just now in the middle of the permitting. We do not have projected shovels in the ground, but we certainly can provide that at a later date.

MS. DAVIDSON: Is there an estimated start date?

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: Not at this time.

MS. DAVIDSON: Is it like a year from

now or next week, next spring?

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: I'm sorry. I'm having a really hard time hearing you.

MS. DAVIDSON: Is there any idea? Is it the spring, is it going to be a year from now? Any idea?

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: We do not have a projected start date, but when we do, I'm happy to share it with you.

MS. DAVIDSON: What about the number of stories? Has that been reported?

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: Six is proposed.

MS. DAVIDSON: So six, okay. So I had a few comments. First of all, someone earlier said that the building next door was very much in favor. None of my neighbors are in favor of this. It's going to wipe out the view of an older woman who lives upstairs. She's very upset about that. Many of the neighbors next door share the adjoining wall, and we did -- many of us did attend one of the town hall meetings, and no one there was for it. So I'm not quite sure. We also have an email tree, and nobody is for it that I know of. Okay, so that's just one

comment.

Mr. Biernbaum raved about the prices and the demand being very high, and he said from the units in his building, he knows that. I have been trying to move. My unit has been on the market for three months, not one offer. My unit is on the first floor in the rear, completely renovated and modern. There's also a renovated unit next to me. They've had a few open houses and appear to have given up.

So I'm not quite sure what Mr. Biernbaum is talking about. There's no demand in this area, not right now, and we just don't know. My realtor has told me the same. So that's kind of strange.

Mr. Veksler spoke about -- I kind of agree with him. You know, I just wanted to say his concerns, I found, were very valid.

This is a very noisy area. I live there. There are noises all the time outside. There are parties on Verndale next door to me. In the next block down going toward Allston, I saw a huge party there Friday night spilling into the street.

I get no peace. That's one of the reasons that I'm trying to move. We have had to lower our price around three times now. It's rock bottom right now, still no offers. So, you know, again, Mr. Biernbaum, don't get it.

Okay, very noisy. Bus stop, as someone mentioned, very active bus stop. Now, you get a mix there of people who are just hanger outers. They sit there all day, you know, they whatever. Some are drinkers, whatever. They've never bothered me. But they are there, and I'm concerned for them. This will disrupt their routines.

There are also many people that are just bus riders that are there, and I'm really surprised that this hasn't been mentioned, except for one woman who just spoke. I wanted to say I absolutely agree that one space for Ubers and Lyfts, that's a pipe dream.

The last thing, people can afford the types of rents that I believe are going to be -- yes, there are some affordable units that are planned, but most of them will be high. Market rate is high. They're not the types that want to

be inconvenienced. You know, they've got the money. They will have cars. I guarantee they'll find a place to park.

There's always -- there's no parking around there, and there never will be, and that is an issue. So, you know, I'm all for denser housing, but I have some serious concerns, and they are shared by, as far as I know, everyone in my building. Thank you.

MR. PANAK: The next speaker is Karen Shmukler. Karen, you can now turn on your microphone and your video, if you'd like, and please give us your name and your address. Then you can deliver your comment.

MS. SHMUKLER: 41 Kenwood Street. I've been a resident for 21 years. I will be brief, because most of my (someone sneezed, lost audio).

I wanted to -- while I applaud and I love my young neighbors on Verndale Street, millenials without cars is a myth. I have them at home. Them and their friends are all car drivers. And while we would love to believe that this development is going to attract young

millenials at these rental rates without cars, it is really just a mythical narrative.

And so I do think we need to seriously think about the impact, as people have said, around parking on Kenwood, around cars on Kenwood. I have been working from home. I walk daily. Almost on a daily basis, I flag someone down on Kenwood to tell them they're going the wrong way.

So I do think we need to not underestimate the parking concerns. I know it's poo-pooed, but both the scale, the density and the real impact -- you know, I know there's lots of all this quantitative research. I can give you 21 years of qualitative research.

I'm all for density. I'm all for affordable housing. We live in an urban area. We should be doing this, but I also want us to be really mindful. And I think the curb onto Kenwood, while yes, it's great for the development, is not safe. I really do worry about the turn onto Kenwood from Harvard, because I see it all the time, and with people crossing that street, people don't pay

attention. We're going to reduce visibility.

And so I do think these are significant things that have not been mitigated and that really need to be really looked at, and if we're doing studies, as one of the other callers said, we have plenty of time to do proper research. So I don't think it's acceptable that there are half baked studies put in terms of this design and asking people to just take this.

There really is no excuse for that. We wouldn't accept that as proper research in any other area. So I just wanted to share that. I wasn't actually planning on commenting, but I really think that there does need to be some serious consideration to that. Thank you so much for allowing my comment.

MR. PANAK: And that's all we have for public comment.

MR. GELLER: Excellent. Anything further, questions, comments, thoughts, based on testimony that we've heard thus far? Panel? No. Kate? No.

MS. POVERMAN: Other than me?

MR. GELLER: Fair enough.

MS. POVERMAN: Well, I don't know if this is the appropriate time -- this is Kate -- but I know we're all aware of a letter that Mr. Danesh relating to 45 Marion Street. He submitted it in connection with the 40 Center Street project, saying that when they built 45 Marion, they had -- he basically said he wished they'd put in more parking, and I'd like to get his comment on that at this point. Why would he need more parking there and not need parking here? That building is half a block from the Green Line.

MR. DANESH: Yeah, the sites are very different in terms of the shape. At 45 Marion Street, we could have added a lot of parking. We had the opportunity to because the site is much bigger. So, you know, we didn't, and we had the opportunity to. This site is smaller, obviously, and, you know, we are -- Kate, we're using all the spaces that we can fit there. So, you know, at Marion Street, we had the option to expand, which we didn't choose to. Here, we're using the maximum size of the lot.

MR. GELLER: Does that answer your

question, Kate?

MS. POVERMAN: Yeah, and that's an answer.

MS. SCHNEIDER: Is the reason that you would have -- you wish you had added more parking at 45 be because there was greater demand than you built for?

MR. DANESH: Well, to be honest with you, it wouldn't have cost that much to add a lot of spaces there because the site was so big. You know, we could have added stackers. It was at a time when stackers were just getting introduced, and it would have been the easy way to add parking for minimal cost.

That was in 2014, when the building was being designed. We added stackers to 455 Harvard Street down the street, and it's been great. So I wish we had added more parking to the stackers for a minimal -- not minimal, but for a small cost, you get a lot of spaces. So I do wish we added stackers there.

MS. SCHNEIDER: But I guess the question is why do you feel like you need more parking at that development. I get that, you

know, in hindsight, you could have for, you know, a relatively low amount of money, added more parking spaces. But, I mean, as Kate pointed out, it's an area that's equally well served by public transportation, equally walkable. So what would you have done with the more parking spaces that you wish you had built?

MR. GELLER: Right. There's either demand or there isn't.

MR. DANESH: There's other -- I mean, it would be -- if the space -- we could use -- we could -- the parking spaces that are used on Marion Street, it's a much bigger building, and we have -- you know, I think one thing that hasn't been mentioned throughout this process is there's -- different buildings have different size units, you know, so that building has larger units than this one, and, you know, there's a lot of nuances to each property.

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: So I think one of the things -- this is Jennifer Dopazo-Gilbert. I think one of the things we talked about, too, was expanding the pool of possible tenant applicants, right. So if you have more parking,

you're expanding your pool of possible tenants that may want to rent there.

Here, all of the risk is really on the owner, with six or seven spaces. The risk is on the owner on whether they're going to be able to rent these or not. And if you have one car or two cars, this really isn't going to be the place for you, because these are going to be taken on a first come, first serve basis.

And so that was the other issue with thinking, well, we could have added more parking at a very fair price back then when that was discussed, and they didn't, and they regretted it. Stackers were being more and more used. The system that they put down -- in down the street at 455 Harvard is working really, really well, and so opening up that pool and taking less risk on who you can rent to, I think is probably another consideration.

MS. MORELLI: Could I make a comment -- I'm sorry.

MS. POVERMAN: One of the problems I have with that argument, Jennifer, is that people are on wait lists for affordable housing

for years and years. They're on wait lists even to get on affordable housing.

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: Absolutely.

MS. POVERMAN: So if units come up in a 30-unit building, and there are only six parking spaces, people who need affordable housing, they don't have choice. They need to get a place to live. And if they have a car, you can't just say oh, you don't need that car because you're in affordable housing, and it's not giving them an equal access to an affordable housing place if they cannot live there because of the fact that they cannot get parking.

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: Well, it's not -- again, the parking spaces are first come, first serve, so they're also open and available to the affordable units, as they are at 455 Harvard. But I agree with you. There are lots of wait lists. I think at 455 Harvard, there were close to -- or over 1,000 applications for four units. So no, I hear you, Kate.

And I had a discussion with Virginia Bullock about the un-bundling of the parking, and what they look for is parity, knowing that

the law doesn't require you to have parking for affordable units. That's just the way it is at the moment, but they are available. But I totally agree with your point that it's much, much more difficult.

MR. GELLER: Randolph?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Yes, I've got a question for one of the applicant parties, and it relates to this discussion. It's a question about the range of design options, the schemes for the building, that may have been considered and what information you have about them. You know, one thing you can note about this is that it's an on grade development, right; there's nothing below the street level. And you can see a pretty clear relationship between the six spaces in the puzzle parking machine and the 1700 square feet of retail.

You know, that feels pretty well in balance. I wouldn't want us to have much more parking and much less retail, it becomes maybe unworkable for the retail. But, you know, outside of the 40B process, we had a 40A case, a little bigger than this, but not much bigger,

which on a tight site made use of a lower story for parking, without ramps, sort of an elevator machine that would drop you down. Then you had a level below the first floor of the residence, and that was all for parking.

So that's just an example. My general question is were any designs considered that used any of the lower level or -- you know, that doesn't exist in this design, for parking and, you know, looked at -- and any information about what that would have cost and whether it would have worked as a development?

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: So I think you're talking about a pit system where you're partially underground. So that was looked at, and it was cost prohibitive.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Thank you.

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: Sure.

MS. MORELLI: I just want to -- if I could ask just some clarification. I think there were some assumptions by the questions that were asked that the parking would be used for retail. Is it correct that the parking is only for the residents, and there's no parking

for retail?

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: Correct.

MS. MORELLI: And then the other question is is there any range of retail uses being considered or excluded from the program?

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: You know, we haven't discussed that much. Let me turn that over to Danny or David. Danny is on, and David is on. I don't know if they've discussed it any more. Have you excluded -- you heard the question. Danny, do you want to turn on your mike?

MR. DANESH: We're open to all different types of uses right now. I would like to just answer some -- just kind of clarify something else.

I just want to make sure that, you know, everyone understands that the Uber, Lyft, FedEx, UPS drivers visiting and making drop-offs to the building would pull on -- come from Harvard Street, you know, and park in the loading zone, and not necessarily have to use Kenwood Street, you know. Assuming that they don't have a delivery on Kenwood, you know, they

wouldn't need to use those streets. It would really only be the residents who are using those streets. Thank you.

MR. GELLER: Maria, anything? I see you on mute.

MS. MORELLI: Yeah, I think that's it for me. I guess I just wanted to ask another thing. I guess, and certainly just to understand the parking allocation, so you say it's first come, first serve. Are you marketing it that there are parking spaces, or are you -- you know, are you not going to be leasing to people with cars? I think I just -- and I had asked a question earlier about parking allocation. I just wanted to understand. Are you just not leasing to people who have cars, or just telling them that they can park elsewhere? We just want to understand, I guess, how you're marketing it.

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: Sure. So maybe Danny should speak to that, because it's the same situation at 455. There's not a parking space for every single unit, although, in this particular building, the transportation board

has recommended one bike space per unit. So there will be 30 of those. They also have recommended, and we've agreed, to add additional public parking for bicycles on the public way. But Danny, can you speak to the lease up and first come, first serve for limited parking?

MR. DANESH: Sure. So as we've discussed tonight, there's very limited parking at this property, this development. And if you have a car, and you want to live in Brookline, and you're going to be, you know, using your car for work or whatever reason you need a car, this is not the building for you.

If you will take the bus or a zip car or the T or a bike to work on your daily commute, then this building makes sense for you. So you're not going to -- there's no reason for, you know, someone to come to this building and say, hey, I need a parking space, or even two parking spaces, when we have limited parking. So there's plenty of other options in Boston that they can live at if they need parking.

MS. SCHNEIDER: So how are you going to -- so what are you going to do with the six

parking spaces? You know, someone comes in and they want to lease a unit. There are six parking spaces. You say, hey, do you want a parking space, or do you say there are no parking spaces? Maria, I think that was more your question, right?

MS. MORELLI: Yes.

MR. DANESH: And that's a question that, you know, we'll have to work with the marketing, our team, and we'll figure it out. But there will be, you know, six apartments that do have parking. So if it's a first come, first serve basis, if it's for people who have bigger units, if it's for -- I don't know. It's just -- you know, those are -- those are two possible scenarios.

MS. MORELLI: Mr. Danesh, we can't hear you. I'm not sure if we lost a connection.

MS. SCHNEIDER: I think I heard him. But I guess my question is how do you reconcile that with the un-bundling requirement that it looks like the transportation board has requested?

MS. DOPAZO-GILBERT: Sure. Let me

speak to that, because I had a long conversation with Virginia Bullock about un-bundling, and it was discussed for a long, long time Monday evening at the transportation board.

So if the rent is -- I'll just throw it out there -- $2,000 a month, and the spaces are going for $200, you're not -- that's not going to be part of your rent. So if the spaces are all taken, the only one that's going to get priority and kicked out of that space and have to go find another space is if there's a handicap unit that also has a vehicle where they need the handicap space.

The affordable is also un-bundled, insofar as you can't add the parking to their rent, but if they needed a space and wanted a space, and one was available, they would have to also pay the market rent if a space was available. So when they go to lease up, if the first six or seven folks want parking, they'll pay for it separately. I mean, the whole purpose, right, behind un-bundling is to hope that people will dump their car and say that's really not worth it, look where I'm living, and

there's -- you know, Chris Dempsey made a point to say look, I don't have a car. I use the Enterprise right near your building -- proposed building over on Comm. Ave., and I also use the zip car, which is right there also.

And so we also heard from another transportation board member, who was pretty adamant that no parking should be provided here because of the location and that that space that is used for the parking should be used to either lower the building or redesign the building to add another unit or step it back or what have you. So we talked about that quite a bit. Does that explain it a little bit better, Johanna?

MS. SCHNEIDER: Yeah. Jennifer, that's a helpful answer, and I think quite different than what your client was suggesting. That is a better answer, so thank you.

MR. GELLER: Great. Our next hearing is a week from tonight.

MR. PANAK: Mr. Chair, very quickly, I think we may have one more public comment. Somebody raised their hand after we finished the public comment period. I don't know if you want

to take it or not.

MR. GELLER: Yeah, absolutely.

MR. PANAK: Sylvia Smith, I've promoted you to a panelist. You can now turn on your microphone and your video, if you'd like, and give us your name and address, and then you can give us your comment.

MR. POWERS: So it's Harry Powers and Sylvia Smith at 24 Verndale. So I think I heard correctly that there was a meeting on 9/26 that dealt with the size of the project. Is that true?

MS. MORELLI: There is going to be a meeting September 30 --

MR. POWERS: September 30?

MS. MORELLI: -- that will review architecture.

MR. POWERS: So we only received a notice for this meeting tonight. We have not received a notice in the mail for any other meeting.

MS. MORELLI: Right.

MR. POWERS: I would like to know how we attend that meeting.

MS. MORELLI: So Mr. Chair, I could answer that.

MR. GELLER: Please.

MS. MORELLI: Because we -- for a 40B, we open a hearing, and we only notice the first hearing. Because there is such a big gap between the January meeting and this one, we decided to renotice the January -- excuse me, the September 23.

So for subsequent hearings, we won't be sending anything in the mail, but what you can do is go to the planning department website. There are two places. You can go to the town calendar, and you'll see the town calendar will list the hearing dates. You can go to the planning department, and for the 40B cases, you'll see a page for 500 Harvard, and I list all of the -- like a calendar of all of the upcoming hearings.

MR. POWERS: Will that include the Zoom meeting sites?

MS. MORELLI: Yes.

MR. POWERS: It will?

MS. MORELLI: So when you find out

when the hearing is, you go to the town calendar, and you just click on the actual agenda item, and you'll see on the agenda there's a Zoom link.

MR. POWERS: Okay, town calendar. All right. Very well. Thank you very much.

MS. MORELLI: You're welcome.

MR. GELLER: Victor, do you have anybody else?

MR. PANAK: No, that should do it.

MR. GELLER: Great. Then our next hearing is next week, next Wednesday night, which is September 30 at 7:00 p.m. via Zoom. The contact information, if not already on the town site, will be posted, as will other information pertinent to next week's hearing. The primary topic of next week's hearing will be peer review involving design aspects of the project. Anything else?

MS. MORELLI: I think that's it. I think we can wait until next week maybe just to talk about the schedule, because we do have a hard stop of mid-December.

MR. GELLER: Yeah. Let me touch on that very briefly. One, we do need to touch on

the schedule and sort of play out how we're going to fit in whatever needs to be fit in within the timeline. So we need to set our milestones.

Two, I think that at the next hearing, once we've had peer review on design aspects, it will be incumbent upon the board members to start to hone their charge to the developer, whatever that may be. So I would just note that for the board members.

I want to thank everyone for participating this evening, I know it's been kind of a late evening, and we will see you next Wednesday. We are adjourned.

C E R T I F I C A T E

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

NORFOLK, ss.

I, ARLENE R. BOYER, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby certify:

That the proceedings herein was recorded by me and transcribed by me; and that such transcript is a true record of the proceedings, to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand and notarial seal this 4th day of October 2020.

Arlene R. Boyer, CVR

Notary Public

My Commission Expires

November 21, 2025

&

& 70:3

0

0445 2:7

1

1 50:14
1,000 63:22 113:20
1-126 1:1
1/2 50:18
100 30:8 46:13 86:13,14,16
10:00 18:16 27:14
114 21:24
12 4:18 16:22 44:16 45:7
128 15:19 21:9 72:15,16
13 12:17 75:5
130 86:17
150 82:3
16 10:6 45:8 69:3 77:3
17 10:12 12:22 21:23 41:12 61:4
1700 41:14 53:15 114:18
18 10:12 44:16 45:7
1890 46:13 79:2
19 4:20,23 10:12
1915 46:14 79:3
1981 81:2

2

2 10:13 42:11 48:13 50:5,17 51:6 54:9 77:4 81:23
2,000 120:6
2,825 10:22
2.3 41:23
20 45:8
200 42:3 47:24 120:7
2010 56:18 58:12
2014 71:16 110:15
2018 71:16
2020 1:16 4:18 10:6 12:17,18 56:20 57:1 126:14
2025 126:21
21 106:16 107:15 126:21
21414 126:17
23 1:16 42:13 47:20 93:4 123:9
24 17:2 33:17 96:3 122:9
240 22:2
25 21:16,18,18
26 12:20
2600 13:20
28 94:5

3

3 10:13 51:11
3.9 58:19
30 8:22 10:13 21:15 41:11 93:4 113:5 118:2 122:14,15 124:12
302 21:19
31 12:21
32 71:14 98:5
333 2:6
36 22:1
384 46:19
39 49:5

4

4 44:15,23 49:6 50:5,14 51:5 77:3 101:7
40 68:5 74:4 109:5
4003 43:11 44:7
40a 114:23
40b 47:3 114:23 123:4,16
41 106:15
420 21:16 22:1 47:2 75:18
445 21:16,17,18
45 109:4,6,14 110:6
455 21:16,23 47:2 75:18 110:16 112:16 113:17,19 117:22
47 43:13
48 17:2 33:17
4th 126:14

5

5 58:18 77:3 101:7
500 1:7 3:5 21:15 64:10 90:23 123:17
516 102:14
57 80:5
58 49:16,16 58:18
59 47:4 58:11

6

6 44:15,23 50:5 51:5
617 2:8
64 72:17
65 18:24 23:3
66 43:22
68 42:8 71:12

7

7 44:8,24 50:18 85:11 86:6
70 13:12,19
730-2670 2:8
78 49:16 58:19
7:05 1:17

8

8 12:17
80 74:3
80s 38:2
88 23:18 40:7
8:00 83:23

9

9 77:9 78:14
9/11 60:3
9/26 122:10
92 46:7 47:4 58:11
93 77:8 78:14
95 44:9,24 50:22
9:00 84:8 92:17
9:45 1:17

a

a.m. 18:16,16 27:14,14
ability 18:20 88:5 126:12
able 5:19 10:14 33:23 37:12 62:9 112:5
absolutely 8:11 82:1 100:15 105:18 113:3 122:2
abundance 77:20
accelerate 35:24 36:2 81:5
accelerating 35:21
accept 108:11
acceptable 17:9 19:15 33:22 34:2 34:5 36:15 67:21 108:7

accepted 22:23
access 5:7,8,15 72:23 77:12 113:11
accessible 5:2
accessing 13:11 14:24
accident 89:9 90:3
accidents 90:19
accommodate 24:4 30:2
accommodations 23:16 27:20
account 19:1 22:7 23:4 24:10 44:1,2 45:9 98:20 99:1,5
accurate 6:8,16
achieve 51:20
achieved 39:15
active 81:9 101:18 105:7
activities 76:10 91:24
actual 16:20 35:11 48:3 49:20 50:5 124:2
ada 67:14
adamant 121:8
add 45:5 80:20 81:21 84:24 110:9 110:13 118:3 120:15 121:12
added 109:15 110:5,11,16,18,21 111:2 112:11
adding 18:11
addition 8:16 21:4 47:17 73:4 74:18 94:2 96:17 100:18
additional 34:17 34:18 42:12 74:15 77:23 118:3
additionally 7:11
address 7:3 8:4 10:9 28:9 64:13 79:17,22 80:10 93:18 98:4 101:4 101:7 102:11 106:13 122:6
addressed 13:1 68:1
addresses 79:2
adequate 5:7,8 23:24 34:8 47:19 55:16 69:8 75:9 97:18
adjacent 43:17,20 57:5
adjoining 103:20
adjourned 125:13
adjustments 75:22
administrative 10:3 11:17 12:3
administrator 28:22
advised 4:23 5:16
advising 59:7
affirmative 3:16 4:9
afford 105:20
affordable 46:22 50:22 105:22 107:17 112:24 113:2,6,10,11,17 114:2 120:14
age 46:21 87:22
agenda 3:14 5:5 6:3,5,10 7:16,19 40:11 124:2,3
ago 8:17 46:13 62:13 86:14,17
agree 8:7 30:8 32:1 89:5 104:17 105:18 113:18 114:4
agreed 19:22 118:3
agreement 48:8 69:16
agrees 18:7
ahead 30:6 43:6 78:9
aicp 2:3
air 26:3
airlines 60:4
allocation 117:9 117:15
allow 8:18 18:13
allowed 18:14
allowing 7:9 19:17 19:17 93:21 108:16
allston 44:13 56:17 65:1 91:22 104:22
alternative 76:16
amazon 68:9
american 71:11
amount 8:19 16:19 21:21 47:8 52:18 60:19 61:19 63:10 111:2
analogy 93:10
analyses 96:5 99:11,13
analysis 20:22 21:8,13,14,17 22:7 24:11 74:6 96:2 99:16 100:18,20
analyze 33:15
analyzing 100:3
anecdotally 42:18 55:1
anna 93:15
answer 22:9 59:10 60:12 98:14 109:24 110:3 116:15 121:16,18 123:2
answerable 98:8
answered 65:20 100:23
anticipated 3:13 15:19 21:22 23:11 26:2
anybody 124:8
anymore 59:14
anyway 30:14 31:20 54:15
apartment 60:20 64:1 77:7 81:17 87:23,24
apartments 94:24 119:11
apologize 95:23
appeals 1:6 2:11
appear 7:7 17:4 104:10
appeared 35:15
appears 17:19
applaud 106:19
applicant 2:21 7:22 10:7,10,17,19 10:22,24 18:11,24 19:11 66:3,11 100:4,5 114:8
applicant's 12:8 41:6
applicants 53:4 111:24
application 3:4

applications 113:20
appreciate 88:24 93:11 97:23
approach 75:8
appropriate 9:2,9 37:12 52:1 109:2
appropriately 15:12
approximate 46:5
approximately 15:19 21:9 41:14
architect 51:11
architectural 8:23
architecture 122:17
area 44:10 47:14 48:1 49:8 52:16 55:3 71:12,16 73:11 76:12 91:21 98:20 99:1,6,10,15 100:21 104:13,19 107:17 108:12 111:4
areas 19:13 57:3 72:1,3 77:13,22 80:12
argument 82:10 112:23
arguments 82:9
arlene 126:5,18
arrangement 65:17
art 40:13
articles 25:19
asked 37:18 57:7 60:11 68:3 115:22 117:14
asking 108:9
asks 59:1
aspects 71:6 124:17 125:5
assessment 12:8 12:16 33:24
assist 68:8
associates 70:3
assume 14:24 66:16 91:3
assumed 22:12
assuming 19:1 35:4 56:18 100:6 116:23
assumptions 19:7 22:13 39:16 115:21
atlantic 25:19
atr 74:12,21 75:3
attached 6:1
attend 103:21 122:24
attendees 5:17
attention 96:15 108:1
attorney 2:20
attract 106:24
attracting 87:11
audio 106:18
authorizes 5:6
autonomous 57:20
availability 77:14 78:23
available 6:1 9:23 17:8 25:2 36:21 43:5 54:18 55:21 56:5 57:22 60:18 95:19 113:16 114:3 120:17,19
ave 56:17 121:4
avenue 81:1
average 16:22 17:3 77:1 83:19 84:7,10
aware 5:18 25:8 47:22 62:1 96:18 99:2 109:3
awareness 76:19

b

b 72:8
babies 87:22
back 12:16,21,23 13:2,18 14:17 15:11 20:6 38:1 43:19 44:4 60:1,2 60:4,8 73:19 74:11,16 85:4 94:7 112:12 121:12
background 70:14
backing 89:21 90:2
backup 22:16
baked 108:8
baker's 4:18
balance 114:20
barely 17:9,14 33:22 34:1 36:14
base 53:1
based 14:23 20:22 20:24 26:23 33:21 34:17 42:24 45:3 45:19 58:12 69:6 71:15 72:18 87:10 108:20
basically 51:14 61:2 86:5 109:7
basis 25:1 72:17 107:7 112:9 119:13
beacon 49:1
bear 44:4
bedroom 41:23,24
beds 41:12,13,13
beginning 66:15 91:12
behalf 40:14
behavior 38:6
believe 18:23 20:12 51:22 58:17 66:19 71:16 81:19 82:11,16 98:1,18 105:21 106:23
bell 50:3
benefit 16:2,6 33:2
best 68:4 73:14 126:12
better 4:1 17:2 19:23 72:22 78:13 121:14,18
beyond 87:8
bicycles 118:4
bicycling 71:8
bicyclists 73:5
biernbaum 85:10 85:11,17 104:2,12 105:5
big 32:24 83:21 93:9 94:14 110:10 123:6
bigger 76:19 109:17 111:13 114:24,24 119:13
biggest 89:5,7
bike 22:18 118:1 118:15
bikes 23:13
biking 19:3
bit 14:12 20:6 23:20 24:3 25:9 30:2 31:22 32:21 34:4,15 35:9 37:1 37:2,5,8,10 43:19 45:6 58:10 80:18

83:15 95:22 101:23 121:13,14
block 95:17 97:14 104:22 109:11
blocked 80:24
board 1:6 2:11,13 2:14,15 3:7 9:7 19:21 28:15 36:9 51:16,22 52:10 54:4 66:21 67:2,2 67:20,22 68:2,5 117:24 119:22 120:4 121:7 125:6 125:9
bodies 5:1
body 5:6,24
boston 27:22 28:8 48:1,2 49:8 57:12 59:20 63:19 64:3 64:13,15,18 65:12 72:2 76:12 77:6 118:21
bothered 105:11
bottom 7:6 105:4
boundaries 45:2
boundary 63:23
boyer 126:5,18
bracket 43:18
brad 98:2,2,5
brainerd 81:16 91:20,21 92:14
braked 91:14
branch 72:8
brandon 2:18 40:13,20 43:6 52:8 54:2 56:14 65:21
brave 92:4
break 22:3 74:16 89:23
brief 11:24 106:17
briefly 66:13 124:24
brighton 44:13 55:6 56:17 64:17 65:2
bring 23:7 32:13 54:18 55:19 71:5 96:11 102:5
bringing 91:24 92:7
brings 90:21
broadcast 5:21
broader 8:13,19
brookline 1:5 2:5 2:7 9:17 24:18 43:12 44:7,11,24 45:14 46:2 48:21 52:21 55:24 56:16 60:19 64:24 65:13 66:18 78:15,19,23 86:2 87:7 88:16 90:14 101:24 118:10
brookline's 46:16
brooklinema.gov 2:9
btd 27:23
budget 10:19 11:14
build 87:15 88:11 99:12,12
building 41:16 54:8,9 61:1,7 62:12,14,17,20,23 68:10,16 69:3 86:17,24 88:12 90:24 91:6,19 93:2,10 94:3 103:15 104:4 106:9 109:11 110:15 111:13,17 113:5 114:11 116:20 117:24 118:13,16,18 121:3,4,11,11
buildings 60:21 78:14 86:13 87:2 87:4 91:18,20,23 93:9 111:16
built 46:13 79:2 86:10,16 99:14 109:6 110:7 111:7
bullock 113:23 120:2
bumps 81:6 94:14
bunch 81:17 85:20
bundled 120:14
bundling 113:23 119:21 120:2,22
burdening 29:17
bus 37:14 43:22 72:9 73:5 88:1 101:18,21 105:6,7 105:15 118:14
business 6:7

c

c 2:1 3:1 126:1,1
cable 9:17
café 53:8,18
calculated 49:5,15
calculating 49:18
calculations 70:17 70:23
calendar 5:14 123:14,14,18 124:1,4
call 3:15 4:8 6:22 7:3 28:24 79:14
called 6:13 47:15 90:14
callers 108:6
calling 7:12 28:8 59:12
calming 36:11,20 37:2
cambridge 72:3
canals 93:9
canned 7:15
capability 77:14
capacity 56:2,4
capture 74:19,22 75:3
captured 5:21 75:2,5
car 25:21,24 38:19 55:7,19 56:22 64:12,19,19 65:8 69:13 76:15 87:13 87:16,18,24 88:2,4 91:13,15 95:3 106:22 112:6 113:8,9 118:10,11 118:12,14 120:23 121:2,5
care 5:19
carmageddon 59:12
cars 26:1 27:17 54:7,15,18,20 59:19 76:14,15 81:4 82:10,12,18 82:23 83:2,3,5,20 84:18 89:10,14 92:10,18,19 94:20 94:21 95:5 97:12 97:21 101:10 102:3,4 106:2,21 107:1,5 112:7 117:13,16
case 21:7,13 22:4 31:10 52:21 82:11

86:17 99:20 100:5 114:23
cases 123:16
cast 101:11
cat 85:8
categorized 53:10
cats 85:5
census 42:21,24 44:11 49:23 56:14 56:18,20 57:15 58:5,22 75:22 76:5
center 109:5
certain 8:19 28:9
certainly 8:7 14:8 15:24 16:1,6 17:5 19:9 24:2,22 25:7 26:6 30:18,19 32:3 34:14 36:24 68:8 96:24 102:20 117:8
certified 126:5
certify 126:8
chabad 95:8
chair 10:9 121:21 123:1
chairman 2:12
challenge 39:22
challenging 89:20
chances 64:11
change 57:2 76:18
character 87:5
characteristics 50:8
charge 125:7
chat 7:4,5,7
children 87:22 94:1 97:4,4,10
chime 100:2,9
choice 71:5 72:22 73:14 87:14,16 88:11,17,18 97:3 113:7
choose 87:13,18 109:22
chosen 86:21
chris 121:1
circulate 73:18
cite 48:24
cited 53:7
city 27:22,23 49:2 49:3 82:12
clarification 115:20
clarify 116:15
cleaning 64:21
clear 6:6 96:3 114:16
clearly 6:15 57:8 83:16
click 7:6 124:2
client 121:17
clients 52:1 57:10 60:11
cliff 47:23
climate 76:18 101:14
close 10:6 13:14 18:1 31:2 32:15 113:19
closed 38:2
closely 17:7
closer 22:11 49:2,8
cluster 49:12 50:6
coffee 53:18
collect 24:24 50:10
collected 34:23 35:16 48:12 50:4 58:20 70:14
collecting 56:19
collision 92:23 93:1
columbia 37:24 80:23 90:13 94:5 94:8,9,13 95:1,15 96:22 97:1
come 29:22 34:20 54:15 73:2 90:12 94:3,6,8 97:5 112:9 113:4,15 116:20 117:10 118:6,18 119:12
comes 32:8 36:20 44:14 58:5 83:20 119:1
comfortable 34:7 60:7
coming 31:14 45:21 51:3
comm 56:17 121:4
comment 5:12 6:12,24 7:24 8:19 9:3,6 37:19 61:9 78:5 85:1 101:5 102:12 104:1 106:14 108:16,18 109:9 112:20 121:22,24 122:7
commented 25:20
commenting 108:13
comments 9:1 12:21 16:18 33:10 39:16 51:9,18 54:2 63:21 66:4 66:14 69:21 70:7 78:3 79:16 90:21 93:19 102:7 103:14 108:20
commercial 82:5 96:18,20,21
commission 126:20
committee 99:2
common 28:10,11 86:2
commonly 44:10
commonwealth 4:20 81:1 126:2,7
communities 24:18
community 2:4
commute 118:15
commuter 71:11
comp 46:15 49:9
company 59:9
comparables 86:12,14
compared 21:7,12 51:5
comparing 21:3 25:3
comparison 100:9 100:12
comparisons 91:21
compile 24:20
completed 62:18
completely 13:1 30:24 104:7
compliant 23:18 40:7
component 6:24
comprehensive 3:4 29:4
comprised 3:8
compromise 93:23 93:24 97:3,3
computer 5:20 6:14
concern 13:13,21 14:8 18:18 21:4 54:4,12 81:12 83:6 84:16,19

89:8 97:15 98:12
concerned 25:6 95:22 105:12
concerning 4:19
concerns 13:13 14:13 15:7 22:4 67:23 82:7 101:23 104:18 106:7 107:11
concessions 62:20
conclude 6:10
concludes 20:19
conclusion 34:21
conclusions 39:15 49:23
condo 69:3
conduct 5:2 6:7
conducted 4:16 6:22 70:16,17 74:3
conference 5:13 5:18
confidence 74:7
confident 75:9
confirm 3:12 79:22 99:4
conflict 16:5 33:5
conflicts 73:6
confused 101:23
congesting 98:13
congestion 76:11 98:11 100:20,20 102:6
congratulations 84:14
connection 99:15 109:5 119:18
cons 15:16 16:1 32:14
consensus 70:11 70:18
conservative 22:15 35:6,9 72:18 75:8
consider 29:23 46:15
considerably 81:7 81:19 83:24
consideration 23:15 89:2 108:15 112:19
considered 19:15 43:20 45:24 114:11 115:7 116:5
considering 16:15 42:7 45:2,15 46:1 49:22
consistent 4:17
consists 81:17
consolidated 28:6
constantly 97:7
construction 62:22 67:14 96:14
consult 28:23
consultant 33:14 66:13 70:3 84:5
consultants 2:18 82:20 98:14 99:5 99:19
contact 124:13
context 9:9
continue 12:3
continued 71:19 71:20
contractors 96:13
contribute 47:9
contributing 76:20
contributions 24:22
controlled 101:14
convenient 30:17
convening 5:12
conversation 6:20 20:16 120:1
coolidge 28:5,13 41:19
corner 3:10 16:20 16:21 24:2 28:5 28:13 29:18 31:3 31:14 35:11,17 38:2,20 40:2 41:19 72:10 91:10
corners 23:19,20 34:15 37:1,8,9 40:7,8
correct 72:14 79:3 115:23 116:2
correctly 39:15 85:15 122:10
correlate 49:17
cost 67:12 88:14 110:9,14,20 115:11,16
council 47:14
count 35:12
counting 21:6
counts 14:2,5 77:12
couple 10:18 12:13 25:19 31:4 33:12 34:16 51:22 54:3 58:17,21 66:12 75:16 91:22 96:1
course 15:20 37:9 67:12 74:4 80:17 83:1,13,18
court 85:2 126:5
cover 6:6 41:7
coverage 72:4
covid 4:20,23 24:13 25:6 71:21 96:9
crash 73:9 89:8
crashes 73:11
create 9:5 91:16
created 86:20
creates 92:21,24
credit 7:14
cross 85:6
crossing 23:21 37:4 85:3 97:7 107:24
crosswalk 18:2
crosswalks 67:16
cruise 93:6,8
cube 51:11
cue 7:10 79:19
cueing 84:8
cul 38:4
curb 72:19,22,24 73:12 86:3 107:19
curbs 67:15
curious 63:6
current 4:19 21:1 58:12 59:4 61:1
currently 14:3,9 15:13 18:12 45:15
curve 50:3
cut 15:5 31:19 32:11,19 37:21,24 70:24 72:22,24 73:12 80:24,24 83:1
cuts 72:19
cvr 126:18

d

d 3:1
daily 72:14,16 107:7,7 118:15

danesh 2:21 11:2,5 11:6,7,9,12,13 61:11,12,12,15 62:3,5,11,17 63:13 109:4,13 110:8 111:10 116:13 118:7 119:8,17
daneshes 60:24 61:9
danger 91:5 92:21 92:21
danny 2:21 11:3,5 11:5,13 61:11,12 116:8,8,11 117:21 118:5
data 24:20,24 33:14,21,23 34:6 42:21,24 44:11 48:9,12,16,19,22 49:19,23 50:3,10 50:17,18 51:2 56:14,18,19 57:1 58:1,5,13,16,20,22 60:18 69:7 70:22 71:10,17 72:18 74:2,16,22 76:5,22 77:3,6,10,17 78:11 78:22
date 102:17,20,22 103:8
dated 12:16,21 76:6
dates 123:15
david 11:3 116:8,8
davidson 102:9,13 102:21,24 103:4 103:10,13
day 15:20 16:23 19:19 22:1,2 27:13 83:21 84:10 87:24 89:10,12 95:14 105:9 126:14
days 59:20,21 95:3
daytime 18:23
de 38:4
deadline 10:5
deal 30:22 97:9
dealt 122:11
december 10:6,13 124:22
decent 23:5
decide 9:1
decided 123:7
decision 19:20 88:15 99:3
decrease 57:14 58:4 71:20
dedicated 8:12
defendable 45:3
delay 20:18 32:18
delays 13:24
deliver 93:19 101:5 102:12 106:14
deliveries 94:2 97:19
delivery 92:12 96:14 116:24
demand 42:23 44:9,19 45:3,19 47:10,11 48:3,7,13 49:4,15 50:5 51:7 53:20 56:23 57:3 57:14 58:3 59:5 60:10 61:8 63:11 79:6 86:23 87:1 104:3,12 110:6 111:9
demographic 57:5 58:9
dempsey 121:1
denser 106:6
densify 52:3
density 98:9 107:12,16
department 2:17 28:23 98:18 100:17 123:12,16
depending 16:23
derrick 2:23
design 8:23 32:4 37:13 41:19 67:13 108:9 114:10 115:9 124:17 125:5
designate 29:3
designated 19:12 27:24 29:6
designed 37:11 110:16
designs 115:7
desires 82:24
destination 29:2 53:10,16
detail 34:12
detailed 70:8 78:4
details 10:3 11:18 12:1,3 84:15 89:2
determining 26:4
developed 61:24 95:21 101:9
developer 9:11 20:7 29:12,16 36:12 54:12 125:7
developer's 33:13
developers 92:8
development 2:4 21:1 24:23 27:6 28:14 31:8 46:15 46:20 49:11 55:18 62:10 64:10 78:15 100:12 106:24 107:21 110:24 114:14 115:12 118:9
developments 22:10 23:1 29:22 50:7,21 71:1 75:18 76:1 77:7 78:18 98:23 99:6 99:9,9 100:7,16
difference 75:22
different 9:18 22:13,21 31:4 46:23 49:18 50:8 50:8,9 64:7 75:19 89:2 90:15 96:10 109:14 111:16,16 116:14 121:17
difficult 82:6 89:19 114:5
dip 58:10
dips 58:21
directed 28:10
direction 9:10 89:11,15,24 90:6 90:17 91:14
directly 71:3
disagreement 82:20
disappear 95:21
disconnect 73:22
discourage 32:6
discretion 75:13
discussed 112:13 116:7,9 118:8 120:3
discussion 9:8 13:4,6 25:9 87:8 113:22 114:9
dismissal 86:12

disrupt 105:12
distance 13:19 14:14 15:6 16:13 16:15 17:8,9,14,16 23:24 33:11,12,22 34:7 35:23 36:15 67:24 74:1 75:9
distances 23:21
distancing 4:24
distinguish 83:19
distort 75:1
district 41:18,20 52:17
document 18:6
dogs 85:5
doing 26:14 62:21 71:23 98:22 99:7 107:18 108:5
dominated 87:16 87:17
door 23:10,17 69:2 102:14 103:15,20 104:21
dopazo 2:20 66:7 66:9,11,24 102:16 102:23 103:2,7,12 111:20,21 113:3 113:14 115:13,18 116:2,6 117:20 119:24
double 19:10 21:21 30:16 92:2
doubles 93:3
doubt 94:15
downhill 81:5
dozen 67:4
dramatically 89:13
drawing 49:23
drayson 66:18
dream 105:19
drinkers 105:10
drive 15:12 16:16 53:17 59:13 82:10 82:18 89:14 91:23
driver 15:8 32:17 90:5
drivers 31:9 68:13 90:17 106:23 116:19
driveway 13:4,9 13:10 14:10 15:10 15:23 16:4,14,17 17:6,11,17,20,24 18:12 30:22 31:7 33:3,6 34:13 35:13 39:23,23 40:6 75:15 101:12 101:20
driveways 14:4 94:23,23
drivewway 35:18
driving 38:7 59:18 82:12 89:10 90:6
drop 27:5 28:19 115:3 116:19
dropped 28:11
dry 70:24
drycleaner 53:8
due 4:20 101:23
duet 56:11
dump 120:23

e

e 2:1,1 3:1,1 126:1 126:1
earlier 27:12 38:3 71:21 103:14 117:14
easy 84:11 110:13
ecosystem 54:22 63:19
effect 82:17
effective 6:7 59:17
effectiveness 36:23
efficient 9:5,12 82:13
eight 46:4
either 14:24 25:15 27:6 32:18 33:4 65:15 75:4 94:7 111:8 121:10
elderly 46:21 50:20
element 21:2 37:2
elevator 115:2
eliminated 17:22
eliminating 18:3,5 18:8 40:5
eloquent 7:15
else's 64:13
elsewhat 65:7
email 103:23
emergency 4:19
emphasis 76:17
empirical 24:24
encourage 19:10 48:17 101:19
encourages 69:13
ended 35:4
endowed 90:8
enforce 64:20
enforcement 64:5 64:7 65:4 102:1
engage 6:19
engineer 100:5
ensure 6:8
enter 7:4 35:20
entering 16:16 17:10 36:18 74:21
enterprise 121:3
entire 46:22
entirely 5:6
entrance 89:16 97:8
environment 86:16
environmental 2:19 12:7,12,19 70:7
ep 84:5
equal 113:11
equally 111:4,5
equates 24:1
especially 19:7 22:5 24:18 67:13
essentially 39:8 46:10 50:3
estimate 83:7
estimated 21:19 21:24 22:2 102:21
etcetera 19:3,3,24 21:11 22:18 23:13 24:11 67:16,16 97:12,22
evening 3:7 8:12 65:24 66:10 67:1 69:23 79:18 92:1 92:15 120:4 125:11,12
evening's 8:13
everybody 59:1 62:9
everybody's 96:9 96:10
everyone's 96:1
evidence 47:16
evils 39:22
exact 58:15 61:16 63:1
exactly 86:15 87:5 88:5

example 25:20 28:5 29:15 48:23 53:7 60:24 115:6
excellent 28:20 40:22 70:2 108:19
exception 27:13 51:12,18,23 52:5
exceptions 89:12
excited 82:3
exciting 85:21
excluded 116:5,10
excuse 108:10 123:8
executive 4:18
exist 93:1 115:9
existing 14:3,4 18:12 21:10 29:15
exists 73:24
exit 13:9 73:19
exiting 13:8 16:3,4 16:8,17 17:11,17
exits 14:15
expand 109:22
expanding 69:11 111:23 112:1
expect 33:17 57:1 58:4 90:17
expensive 88:12 88:13
experience 61:6 64:17 69:12 94:9 101:24
expires 126:20
explain 40:24 121:14
explained 83:16
explaining 51:14
extension 10:8
extensive 67:11
extent 57:15,16 59:18 60:22 64:8
extra 55:5
extreme 86:23

f

f 126:1
face 35:7 92:23,23 92:24,24
facility 46:22,24
fact 8:16 13:4,7,14 16:3 17:6,8 20:7 26:1 52:19 80:7 86:14 96:18 113:12
factors 45:21
fair 108:24 112:12
fairly 71:17
fall 42:23 50:9,13
falls 44:8
families 94:19
family 87:20 94:17 94:18
fantastic 63:9
far 12:14 13:24 25:6 30:11 32:1 32:24 36:22 52:24 61:6 64:14 106:8 108:21
faster 17:12 32:22 37:6
favor 7:13 85:24 97:4 103:16,16
feature 5:11
fedex 22:8 90:1 91:2 92:10 116:19
feedback 9:10 41:5 45:11 69:22
feel 34:6 36:12 47:18 48:2 55:22 56:6,21 75:8 93:23 97:17 110:23
feeling 36:7
feels 114:19
feet 13:12,19,20 24:2 41:14 53:15 63:22 114:18
fenway 49:8
fewer 21:20 76:14 76:14,15 83:3 88:12 101:10
field 49:20
figure 24:21 57:17 119:10
figuring 24:10
finally 6:4,21 88:10
find 7:5 15:3 20:13 20:14 39:2,2 55:11 64:11 82:19 84:7 95:3 106:3 120:10 123:24
finding 44:10
findings 12:22 20:19 36:22
fingertips 61:5
finish 56:9 62:23
finished 62:13,24 121:23
firm 34:21 98:22
first 7:1 13:3 24:16 62:18 79:21 85:23 102:14 103:14 104:7 112:9,9 113:15,15 115:4 117:10,10 118:6,6 119:12,12 120:20 123:5
fit 20:15 47:15 109:20 125:2,2
fitzgerald 2:19 12:6,9,11,11 20:24 22:9 24:12,17 26:6,13,16 27:10 30:4,7 31:24 33:19 34:9 36:6 36:16 39:11,13,18 78:24 99:21 100:1
five 21:20 24:1 46:10 59:21 100:16
flag 107:7
flashed 76:23
flexibility 19:4
flip 59:15
floor 6:18 7:24 41:14 42:3 104:7 115:4
flow 27:7 80:16
flux 60:10
fly 94:12
focus 12:23
focused 76:12
focusing 14:22
folks 68:13,16,22 84:14 101:19 120:20
follow 6:3 20:11
following 21:14
foot 42:3 68:5
footage 21:2
footprint 52:2 53:16
foresee 60:5
foreswore 25:24
forth 12:23 13:2 20:6 74:17 85:4
forward 85:19 101:8,9
found 10:1 21:17 69:6 104:18
four 72:7 79:1 92:3,4,18,18 97:6 113:20

frankly 65:20
free 88:1,4
friction 74:23
friday 78:6 104:23
friend 55:2 90:4
friends 97:11 106:22
front 23:10,17 35:18 75:20 81:7 81:8 85:1 86:8
frontage 101:15
frustrated 31:10 38:6 68:13
frustration 15:8 32:18
full 19:24 61:7 67:4 74:6 94:24 96:2,5
fully 34:7 59:22 63:8 78:16 95:16 95:16
funds 10:22
funeral 95:14
funerals 95:13
fungible 53:12
funnel 31:16
further 29:7 65:1 98:13 108:20
future 26:4 65:24 100:6

g

g 3:1
gain 48:5
gap 123:6
garage 14:15,17 20:15 46:17
garages 57:12 81:21
gas 61:23 62:3,6 63:4
gases 76:18
gateway 49:1
geller 2:12 3:2,8 3:19,22 4:4,7,11 4:13 10:23 11:8 11:10,15,17,21 12:5,10 24:6 26:9 37:16 39:5,12,14 40:10,18,20,22 52:7,10,15 53:24 56:8 60:16 63:16 65:19,23 66:2 78:7,9 79:10,12,14 88:20 108:19,24 109:24 111:8 114:6 117:4 121:19 122:2 123:3 124:7,10,23
general 24:9 48:8 76:10 98:21 115:6
generally 8:20 53:10 99:17
generate 6:16 15:19 23:11 53:20
generated 13:23 21:19,24 24:5 44:19
generating 13:23
generation 14:22 19:1,9 20:5,9,22 21:6,7,13 70:16,16 70:20,22 71:6 72:14 73:24 75:19
geometrics 51:10
getaway 14:7
getting 26:1 77:20 84:12 85:19 101:20 110:12
gilbert 2:20 66:7,9 66:11,24 102:16 102:23 103:2,7,12 111:20,21 113:3 113:14 115:13,18 116:2,6 117:20 119:24
give 7:22 9:2,10,24 33:23 43:1,5 48:14 53:4 93:18 98:4,21,22 99:8 101:3 102:10 106:13 107:14 122:6,7
given 7:17 8:16 18:23 19:7 26:22 33:24 43:16 53:14 76:17 86:23 96:5 96:8,8 98:8 99:12 99:12 101:18 104:10
gives 43:23 45:1
giving 8:4 79:16 113:10
global 29:8 39:6 43:24
go 7:18 10:16,20 12:1 28:18,24 30:1,6 35:1,1 38:15 40:4 43:6 44:4 54:7 59:22 68:18,18,23 69:15 69:21 73:13 74:11 78:9 81:24 89:23 90:17 92:4 94:7 97:13 120:10,19 123:12,13,15 124:1
goes 7:14
going 8:22 11:4 22:3 24:13 26:5 26:17 27:1,12 28:7 29:22,24 30:7,13,17 31:6,9 31:16,16 33:6 35:24 36:3 38:11 38:13,20 39:2,6 40:11,11 53:6,17 53:20 54:14 55:13 58:1 59:4,13,13,24 64:14 66:16 68:14 68:17 72:4 73:6,7 75:9 78:12 79:14 79:18 80:21 81:4 83:12,13 84:18 85:4,21 87:15 92:16,22 95:20,21 98:12 102:2,4 103:5,17 104:22 105:21 106:24 107:8 108:1 112:5 112:7,8 117:12 118:11,17,23,24 120:7,7,9 122:13 125:1
good 26:13 27:15 27:19 40:21 48:9 49:9,19 51:13 60:12 66:10 72:4 73:3 101:21
governor 4:17
governor's 5:4
grade 114:14
graduate 90:7,8 90:11
grant 10:8
great 3:19 4:13 25:1 26:9 30:19 33:1 40:19 52:10 63:12,16 66:2,24 77:10 79:12 82:10 82:13 83:4 84:15 88:3,4 102:2,5 107:20 110:18 121:19 124:10

greater 76:11,17 77:6 110:6
green 3:10 43:17 43:21 72:8 109:12
greenhouse 76:18
ground 6:6 41:14 42:3 102:19
group 46:23
guarantee 84:21 106:2
guess 26:19 31:21 61:2 64:5 84:3,3,5 98:7 110:22 117:7 117:8,18 119:20
guessing 57:13
gun 34:24,24 74:12

h

hail 88:3
half 15:10 50:20 50:21 108:8 109:11
halfway 85:2
hall 103:21
hand 70:20 121:23 126:13
handicap 120:11 120:12
hanger 105:8
happen 83:10 90:19
happening 46:15 91:11
happens 32:20 55:1 59:24 85:14 92:13,14,14
happier 86:9
happy 67:7,17 86:4 103:8
hard 36:19 37:7 103:3 124:22
harry 122:8
harvard 1:7 3:5 13:6,11,15,18 14:7 15:2,23 16:3 17:7 17:20,24 18:10 21:15,15,16,18,23 23:9 27:8,16 31:3 31:20 32:15 33:3 38:15 40:6 46:6 46:20 47:2 64:10 68:6 72:20,24 73:8,19 75:15,19 81:1 86:7 90:23 91:8 92:22,23 96:19,22 97:8 98:9,13 102:14 107:22 110:17 112:16 113:17,19 116:21 123:17
head 52:12 63:2
heading 83:22
hear 3:15,18 8:7 8:11 9:6 11:7,9 12:9 40:12,16 61:13 66:15 69:17 70:1 82:10 85:12 86:12 113:21 119:18
heard 9:10 14:16 57:9 68:12 69:22 78:3 82:15 96:1 108:21 116:10 119:19 121:6 122:9
hearing 1:6 3:3 4:15 5:5,11,12,15 5:16 6:2,5,22 7:1 7:19 8:14,20,23 9:2,12,14,20 10:6 10:16 103:3 121:19 123:5,6,15 124:1,11,15,16 125:4
hearing's 6:2
hearings 5:2 9:22 123:10,19
hefty 23:12 26:23
hello 11:9 40:16 85:10 93:20
help 6:7 23:21 24:3 34:15 36:17
helpful 34:12 121:16
helps 6:16 37:1,3 48:10
hereunto 126:13
hey 118:19 119:3
hi 11:12 26:12,13 54:1 61:15 98:5 101:6 102:13
hiding 3:9
high 17:4 41:8 78:2 81:18 104:3 105:23,24
higher 23:2 47:9 47:11 81:23
highlights 41:2 69:15
hindsight 111:1
historically 80:23
history 73:9
hit 41:2 45:13 94:9
hitting 91:15
hmm 54:16
hold 6:12 56:8,12
home 25:14 59:16 89:10 106:22 107:6
homes 68:22
hone 125:7
honest 74:5 110:8
honestly 82:8
honor 90:9
hope 120:22
hopefully 9:11 85:12
host 7:8
hour 16:23 17:2 17:12 18:15 24:1 27:14 33:17 34:16 35:1,5 75:4,6 83:22 96:3
hours 19:19 33:16 34:6 67:3 68:7 74:4 84:21
house 38:10,11 95:8
houses 81:18 93:4 94:17,18,18 104:9
housing 46:22 50:21,22 77:24 86:9,18 88:15,16 88:17,18,19 106:7 107:17 112:24 113:2,6,10,11
huge 25:9 86:2,18 93:3 104:23

i

icon 7:5,6
idea 17:3 18:13 20:10 33:1 59:12 73:3 76:13 103:4 103:6
ideal 26:20
identified 27:11 46:17
identifies 5:14
identify 4:14 7:2 25:4 74:6
identifying 15:15 16:21

ifs 64:14
ignore 88:10
illegal 14:6,12 31:7 32:2,2 84:20 97:13
imagine 84:11,12
impact 24:10 31:21 37:7 54:21 59:5 67:12 95:7 107:4,13
impactful 27:4
impacting 27:6 58:3
impacts 26:7,7 77:22 100:4,13
implement 36:13 67:8
important 24:19 30:9 50:1,15 58:15
impossible 95:2
impressed 80:7
improve 37:4
include 5:8 42:13 44:18 100:17 123:20
included 22:14 23:1 46:4 77:6,6 100:19
includes 71:8
including 67:5 87:2 101:16
income 88:17,19
inconvenienced 106:1
increase 11:13 25:16 41:24 69:14 89:14
increased 89:8 98:9
increases 90:2
increasing 25:21 69:11 102:6
incumbent 125:6
independent 20:13
indicate 71:12
indicates 35:2
indoor 81:20
industry 14:23 20:11 24:9 58:9 59:3
infinite 9:1
inform 10:18
information 8:6 8:10 9:19,24 15:14 22:17 25:1 34:18,18 35:6,16 42:9,15 47:12 49:15,20 51:1 57:15 58:23 61:18 63:3,7,9,18 78:15 99:3 114:12 115:10 124:13,14
initial 41:4
inquisitors 39:7
insofar 120:15
install 74:16
installed 74:14
instance 22:16 55:6,10
instances 22:12 34:22 35:3
interesting 25:16 70:19 94:6
interests 74:10
intersection 23:9 23:18 32:19 86:7 100:14
intersections 100:10
interval 74:7
introduce 6:9
introduced 110:12
introducing 38:21 73:12
invitation 6:2
invite 6:11
involve 7:16 101:13
involved 74:24
involves 3:5
involving 124:17
issue 30:24 31:3,5 31:9,11,12 52:4 54:11,12 80:14 81:9,13 94:14 95:6 96:11,16 106:6 112:10
issued 12:22 41:7 47:14
issues 12:24 61:20 70:12 75:12 80:9 94:22
ite 20:12 71:2,4 72:18 73:24
item 124:2
items 51:12 70:10

j

jammed 84:12
jams 84:1
january 8:17 123:7,8
jennifer 2:20 66:7 66:11 70:5,11 111:21 112:23 121:15
jesse 2:12 3:8
jim 2:19 12:5,7,11 26:12 28:2 29:10 37:20 39:5 41:1 59:9 70:21 72:14 74:19 75:24 100:15
jim's 41:4
job 39:8 51:13 84:15
johanna 2:13 3:8 3:19 26:9 37:19 37:20 52:12 53:24 56:9 68:3 121:14
july 12:21 80:16
june 12:20
justifiable 22:19 22:23
justify 22:17 48:10 48:13 51:4
justifying 42:17

k

karen 106:10,11
kate 2:14 3:9,16 20:21 24:6 37:19 52:11 56:8 60:16 78:9 108:22 109:2 109:19 110:1 111:3 113:21
kate's 26:18
keep 30:10
kenwood 13:5,10 14:7 15:3,24 16:2 16:14,16 17:20 20:4 23:9 27:18 28:18 30:23 35:18 38:10 39:2 68:12 68:17,18,23 72:20 72:22 73:16 74:14 74:21 75:11 80:5 80:21 81:4 83:11 83:14 84:17 85:3 89:11,16,18 90:13 91:3,5,11,12 93:3 94:7 97:11 101:12 106:15 107:5,6,8

107:20,22 116:23 116:24
kicked 120:10
kicks 45:6 85:13
kids 85:4 90:12 91:24 101:16
killed 85:8 90:4
kind 27:20 32:24 42:18 45:1 56:16 71:22 91:15 104:15,16 116:15 125:12
kinds 92:9
kirrane 28:22 29:7 67:21
klock 101:2,6,7
know 14:3 15:18 19:12 21:10 22:12 22:24 23:9 24:20 25:1,3 26:21,21,22 26:23 27:10,16,22 28:2,7,15,18,21 29:5,5,10,10,12,14 29:18,20,21 30:13 30:18,18 31:1,10 31:12,13 32:1,7,16 32:24 34:5,14 35:10,12,14 36:4,8 36:9,20,24 37:3,21 37:22 38:1,4,6,8,9 38:11,14,17,18,19 38:23 39:1,18,21 39:23 42:16,18 43:14 44:19,21 45:1,17,18 46:1 47:5,10 48:4 49:7 49:13,19,22 50:2 50:11 51:4,14,17 52:3,5 53:19 54:8 54:10 55:7,11,23 55:23 56:2,15,24 57:4,4,6,8,11,13 57:18,21,24 58:6,6 58:11,15,18,19 59:1,2,6,17,21 60:5,6,9,21 61:19 61:22,24 62:5,13 62:20,22 63:2,5,20 63:24 64:2,3,6,9 64:11,12,13,23 65:1,2,3,6 67:1,22 68:3,13 70:13,20 70:22,24 71:18,20 71:22,24,24 72:11 72:13,20 73:1,4,9 73:13,17,19 74:3 75:2,7,20 76:3,5,9 77:9,16,22 79:6 81:17 83:3 84:20 86:1 89:24 91:1,2 91:16,22,24 92:12 92:15,16,18 93:6,7 93:8 94:20 96:6 96:24 100:1,8 103:24 104:14,17 105:5,9 106:1,6,8 107:11,13,13 109:1,3,17,19,21 110:11 111:1,2,14 111:17,18 114:13 114:19,22 115:8 115:10 116:6,9,18 116:21,23,24 117:12 118:11,18 119:1,9,11,14,15 121:1,24 122:23 125:11
knowing 113:24
knowledge 62:8 126:12
known 48:24
knows 104:4
kolodner 93:15,20

l

lack 101:24
lane 94:23
lanza 79:20,23 80:1,4,5 89:6
large 81:20
larger 24:23 47:8 57:12 111:18
late 125:12
lately 71:4
latham 84:19
law 5:1,10 89:23 114:1
lax 64:8
layout 38:8
lead 9:11 10:1 70:4
learn 38:14,22 59:24
learning 59:16
lease 118:5 119:2 120:19
leased 62:19,21
leasing 117:12,16
leave 15:9
lee 85:10
left 13:11 14:6 31:7,15 32:2,3 89:19
legal 18:2
legitimate 17:19
lesser 39:22
lest 67:22
letter 47:17 109:3
letters 66:17 70:9 78:5
letting 98:6
level 36:23 41:8 78:2 114:15 115:4 115:8
levine's 95:8,12
light 35:5
likewise 26:16
limit 18:20
limited 39:20 68:6 78:20,20 118:6,8 118:20
line 43:17,21 49:2 49:21 51:2 72:8 109:12
lines 45:13
link 124:3
list 56:1 78:18 79:21 98:23 99:9 123:15,17
listen 8:4
listening 93:12
lists 112:24 113:1 113:19
literally 23:10,17 86:8
little 3:2 14:12 23:19 24:3 30:2 31:22 32:21 34:3 34:15 35:9 37:1,1 37:5,8,10 43:19 45:6 58:10 77:16 83:15 86:11 87:2 95:22 101:22 114:24 121:14
live 54:19 55:18 64:17 80:5 85:1 85:11 87:21 88:3 88:4 90:22,23 104:19 107:17 113:8,12 118:10 118:22
lived 64:2,18 94:4
lives 55:2 96:10 103:18

living 38:12,13 64:24 101:14 120:24
loading 18:13,14 18:15,21 19:13,14 19:24 26:21 40:3 68:4,6 86:1,3 97:18 116:22
located 13:5 15:23 16:14 17:7 18:13
location 5:3 13:3 15:22 27:3,15,19 30:22 35:13,13 39:19 40:9 49:5 52:23 65:9 73:3 74:22 121:9
locations 47:24 50:8 77:17 90:15
loitering 89:15
long 5:7 8:17 14:1 15:6 19:19 32:19 58:1 60:3 120:1,3 120:3
longer 16:4 33:2,5 56:2 57:20 94:10
look 10:2 17:1,2 22:11 26:5 38:9 38:17 42:21,22 43:24 44:6 48:18 49:9 50:11,15 55:3 60:2 71:10 73:9 75:21 76:10 113:24 120:24 121:2
looked 16:12,24 44:5 77:8 84:6 108:4 115:10,15
looking 31:1 44:12 44:19,21 45:17 49:21,22 65:10 77:5 85:19 87:6 88:7 99:8 101:8,9
looks 100:6 119:22
loss 20:2
lost 99:14 106:17 119:18
lot 22:12 23:2,11 25:13,14 26:3 36:21 38:21 61:24 62:3,6 65:10,14 69:16,18 76:12 84:15 85:3,22 90:11,12 101:9,17 109:15,23 110:9 110:20 111:19
lots 9:18 56:1 107:13 113:18
love 86:21 106:20 106:23
low 48:13 49:7 53:4 77:9 88:17 88:19 111:2
lower 45:22,24 48:10 49:10 50:16 51:4 57:3 75:3,6,7 80:13,18 83:24 105:3 115:1,8 121:11
lowered 25:8
lyft 26:18 27:2,23 27:24 28:6,16,24 29:13,24 57:18 116:18
lyfts 27:4 97:21 105:19

m

ma 2:7
machine 114:17 115:3
magnitude 47:6
mail 122:20 123:11
main 15:11 41:2
major 37:2 83:6
majority 75:4
making 14:6 99:3 116:19
manage 54:13
management 86:3
manner 4:17
manners 9:15
map 29:4,8 77:5
mapc 47:13,17 48:16 51:2 58:16 66:19 69:4 76:22 83:1
mapc's 82:24
march 4:18 12:17
margin 23:24 34:1
maria 2:3 4:9 7:17 7:17,18 9:24 10:2 11:21 28:1 66:16 98:17 99:11 117:4 119:5
marijuana 29:2
marion 109:4,7,14 109:21 111:13
mark 7:14 66:18
market 79:7 88:16 104:6 105:23 120:18
marketability 54:11
marketing 31:11 54:11 117:10,19 119:10
mass 82:13
massachusetts 126:2,7
massive 87:1 93:5
material 31:21 96:14
materials 5:5,23 9:22
matter 7:20 8:21 9:23 15:8
matters 8:24
matti 101:2,2,6
maximum 42:2,4 42:8 52:24 109:23
mean 16:11 23:3 25:12 29:9 34:10 34:20 36:8 41:22 54:3 57:8 58:14 62:11,16 63:20 76:3 87:20 89:19 90:18 111:3,10 120:21
meander 13:16 15:10 16:9
means 52:17 87:11 88:11,18
measure 80:15
measures 36:10,11 36:13,21
mechanical 81:21 83:17,18
meet 5:6 10:15 17:14
meeting 5:1 6:8 10:12 66:16 122:10,14,19,21 122:24 123:7,21
meetings 82:17 103:21
meiklejohn 2:15 3:10,22,24 4:3,5,6 37:17,17 63:17 65:14,18 79:11 80:22 90:20 114:7 115:17
member 2:13,14 2:15 6:11 121:7

members 3:13,15 5:24 6:19,20 7:1 7:10,11 9:8 52:11 79:15 125:6,9
memorandum 41:3
mention 9:13 10:5 37:21 51:19 69:1
mentioned 23:4 24:15 26:21 31:4 34:3 44:8 49:7 69:9 72:15 74:20 75:17 89:22 90:21 105:7,16 111:15
mentioning 90:10 100:2
met 67:2,7 95:12
metered 18:16 40:3
methodological 20:21
methodologies 48:9
methodology 34:21 42:16 44:14 45:20 49:18
metro 48:1
metropolitan 47:13
microphone 93:17 98:3 101:3 102:10 106:12 122:5
mid 124:22
middle 50:13 102:18
mike 116:12
mile 15:10 49:2 75:5
miles 16:22 17:12 24:1 34:16 35:1,5 75:4
milestones 125:3
millenials 82:18 106:21 107:1
millennials 25:23
mind 30:10
mindful 107:19
minimal 14:18 16:19 110:14,19 110:19
minimum 52:24
minor 37:20
minuses 16:10 32:9 33:8
minute 3:23
minutes 6:8,16 72:8
missed 102:15
mitigate 4:22 94:15
mitigated 108:3
mitigation 23:8 36:10 67:5,18 68:2 96:16
mix 71:23 105:8
mmorelli 2:9
modal 71:5
mode 26:24 55:11 75:23
modern 104:8
modes 71:9,13
moment 43:1 61:17 114:3
monday 67:1 120:3
money 106:2 111:2
month 82:4 120:6
months 62:13,24 95:9 104:6
morelli 2:3 4:9,10 10:4 11:1,4,11,16 11:19,23 28:20 43:4 61:10 66:6 66:23 79:23 80:3 85:16 88:21 93:13 98:16,17 99:4,17 99:24 112:20 115:19 116:3 117:6 119:7,17 122:13,16,22 123:1,4,22,24 124:6,19
morning 68:7 83:23 84:9 95:2
motions 6:12
motorist 13:8 14:15,24 32:10,16 35:19,22,23 36:1 38:6
motorists 13:7,15 13:16 14:10,14 15:12 16:3,8,15,17 17:10,11 20:13 33:6 101:14
move 85:22 86:21 104:5 105:2
moving 73:15 91:13 92:19
multiple 89:17,17
municipal 63:23
municipality 65:15
mute 3:23 6:14 117:5
muted 11:8
myth 106:21
mythical 107:2

n

n 2:1 3:1
name 3:15 4:8,14 6:11,13,18 7:3,4,4 8:4 79:17,22 93:18 98:4 101:4 101:6 102:11 106:13 122:6
names 96:1
narrative 107:2
natr 35:12
naturally 72:4
near 29:1 78:14 121:3
nearby 48:23
necessarily 13:1 31:12 116:22
necessary 34:17
necessitated 94:19
need 8:5 10:2 30:1 34:5 35:11,12 51:16 55:10 56:3 65:23 72:5,5,12 77:19 82:19 83:5 86:2,15 88:15,16 88:17 107:3,10 108:4,14 109:10 109:10 110:23 113:6,7,9 117:1 118:12,19,22 120:12 124:24 125:3
needed 120:16
needing 53:11
needs 29:19 125:2
negative 16:7
neighborhood 16:9 29:18 31:17 31:18 32:11 37:22 37:23 38:16,22 54:23 55:20 64:1 68:14 85:21 86:16 87:5,14,17,18 91:1 91:4 94:16
neighborhoods 13:17 15:6 27:18

97:5 101:13
neighboring 27:7 68:20
neighbors 84:17 85:20 103:16,19 106:20
net 20:2 100:10
network 4:1
networks 4:1
never 105:11 106:5
new 8:10 25:19 38:12,21 85:20 91:23 101:9 102:5
nice 3:10 26:15
night 48:4 104:23 124:11
nine 35:4 42:8
noises 104:20
noisy 104:19 105:6
nonoperational 15:7
norfolk 126:3
normal 55:12,12
normally 33:16
northwest 38:1
notarial 126:14
notary 126:6,19
note 6:3 8:20 50:2 68:15 76:3 86:6 101:22 114:13 125:8
noted 41:16 42:9 44:17 47:13 50:19 58:19 69:9
notes 47:23 80:8 84:13
notice 76:24 81:24 122:19,20 123:5
noticed 80:16
noting 47:18 87:10
notion 18:7 22:14 23:7 32:10,15 35:21 83:16 84:18
november 10:12 126:21
nuances 111:19
number 7:17 8:2 9:14 14:18 20:23 21:1 22:1,4 25:4 36:10 49:7 51:8 53:4 57:16 58:6 61:16 63:1 71:2,3 73:23 74:2,8 77:7 78:21 81:14 83:2 83:21 89:14 90:22 91:12 92:1 95:13 97:19 98:24 103:10
numbers 23:2 35:8 49:17 57:2 61:3 71:18 80:20 81:22 82:21 83:2 83:24 87:9 94:4

o

o 3:1
observation 38:3
observations 16:20 74:2,3,5,8 74:12
observe 14:5 80:18
observed 17:15
obviously 39:17 41:9 43:12,14,22 45:21 47:22 54:4 55:24 56:19 57:23 81:15 82:2 84:14 91:6 93:22 109:19
occasion 17:23
occasional 88:2
occasions 92:1
occupant 64:9
occupied 61:17
occurring 76:7
october 126:14
odd 60:9
offer 8:2,12 62:19 65:5 79:15 104:6
offers 105:4
offs 116:19
oh 113:9
okay 11:13 36:15 56:7,10 80:2 85:15 103:13,24 105:6 124:4
old 86:13 87:2
older 103:18
once 13:18 49:16 50:24 57:20 60:2 60:5 96:12 125:5
ones 81:21 84:5 87:2
oops 84:4
open 4:16 5:1 7:24 41:9 104:9 113:16 116:13 123:5
opening 112:17
operate 100:11
operative 74:19
opinion 19:15 29:11 48:12 59:6 69:10
opportunities 93:23
opportunity 7:23 9:3,6,7 85:18,19 92:24 109:16,18
opposed 13:6,11 65:11,12
opposite 14:10
opposition 7:13 89:3
optimal 15:22
optimistic 83:8
option 109:21
options 39:21 114:10 118:21
order 4:18,22 5:4 7:10 13:7,17 34:6 35:10 47:5 89:22 89:23
original 12:15 51:9
originally 18:11
orphans 46:17
outbreak 4:20
outers 105:9
outside 23:17 42:12 48:2 104:20 114:23
overall 30:20 41:17 46:16 54:22 57:17 98:7
overarching 50:24
overlay 41:19 52:16
overnight 56:1
overwhelmingly 63:24
owner 31:11 102:13 112:4,5
owners 96:20
ownership 25:24 56:22 69:13 76:15

p

p 2:1,1 3:1
p.m. 1:17,17 8:22 124:12
page 123:17

pages 1:1
panak 2:17 4:11 4:12 11:3 43:6 79:20 93:15 97:24 99:22 101:1 102:8 106:10 108:17 121:21 122:3 124:9
pandemic 59:4
panel 108:21
panelist 93:16 122:4
parcel 100:19
pardon 20:18
parity 113:24
park 15:2 30:16 54:21 55:7,18,19 61:23 64:24 65:11 82:4 83:11,12 84:21 87:12 90:13 90:13,13 95:1,4 96:13,15,19 97:6 106:3 116:21 117:17
parked 29:24 38:24 82:1,1 84:18 92:2 95:16
parking 7:22 8:15 10:20 14:19,20 15:4 17:18,19,21 17:24 18:1,3,3,5,8 18:9,16,19 19:9,10 19:18,23 20:2,3,8 20:14,14,23 26:7 27:13 40:1,2,3,5 40:12,15 41:15 42:9,22 44:18 45:3,19 46:6,11,24 47:11,16 48:5,10 51:21 52:4,19 53:4,11,20 54:6,20 54:22 55:12,17 56:22 57:3,11 59:5 60:10,20,21 61:8,16,22 62:6,9 62:10 63:1,4,11,19 64:4 65:10 69:4 69:11 72:6,12 73:21,23 75:11,14 76:2,13,14,21 77:1 77:19,20 78:12,16 78:19,20,21,22 79:8 81:13,20 82:2,4,5 83:7,17 84:1,2,6,22 87:3,8 87:11 88:11,18 89:7 92:10 95:5 95:14,19,20 96:22 96:23,24 98:24 101:24 102:1 106:4 107:5,11 109:8,10,10,15 110:5,14,18,24 111:3,7,12,24 112:11 113:5,13 113:15,23 114:1 114:17,21 115:2,5 115:9,22,23,24 117:9,11,14,22 118:4,6,8,19,19,20 118:22 119:1,2,3,4 119:12 120:15,20 121:8,10
part 31:18 32:7 46:16 48:21 54:10 68:14 100:3 120:8
partially 115:15
participate 3:14
participating 5:17 125:11
participation 5:9 5:9
particular 8:14 21:6 28:7 48:11 99:14 117:24
particularly 53:14 76:17 86:1 94:6
parties 104:21 114:8
partners 2:19 12:7 12:12,19 70:7
party 104:23
patricia 98:1
patrol 65:7
patterns 96:9
pay 65:11 107:24 120:18,21
peace 105:1
peak 16:24 33:16
peaks 48:5
pedestrian 23:16 37:4,5 71:8
pedestrians 16:5 23:8,12 24:4 33:4 73:5 101:16
peds 23:13
peer 7:21,22,23 8:23 10:19,20 12:4,6,13,20 40:12 40:15 42:20 45:16 63:21 66:3 67:9 69:10,17,23 70:6 76:1 124:16 125:5
people 7:9 8:2,5 9:18 10:1 25:13 25:15,22 26:24 27:2 31:6 32:20 38:21 42:1 45:10 48:18 53:6,11 54:14,15,18 55:17 55:21 57:6,17 59:3,7,11,17,18,19 59:21 60:7 62:21 64:19 74:11 76:15 79:19 82:3,9,14,22 83:5,10,12 84:2,22 85:3,22 87:12,17 88:6,8,9 90:22,24 91:2 92:16,20 93:7 94:3,6,12,24 95:11,18 96:17 97:17,20 99:7 101:10,21 102:5 105:8,14,20 107:4 107:23,24 108:9 112:24 113:6 117:13,16 119:13 120:23
percent 18:24 23:3 30:8 41:24 43:13 45:5,9 50:18,22 71:12,14
percentage 60:20 71:19 86:18
perfect 34:9 47:15
performed 12:13 12:19
performing 16:19
period 17:2 33:17 121:24
periods 16:24 18:23
permission 43:5
permit 3:5 6:6 64:22
permitting 64:3,7 102:18
person 38:12 63:6 71:7 79:21 93:13
personal 64:17
personally 87:20
persons 3:13
perspective 12:15 41:21 43:10,23

44:5 51:8,11 54:14
pertinent 9:22 124:15
pets 85:5
phone 6:14
physical 4:24 5:3
pick 26:17 27:5,9
pickup 18:22 27:24 28:6,10,11 28:19
pickups 29:13
picture 32:24
piece 18:4 30:3 47:12 50:1 51:19 58:15 60:2
pierce 98:1
pin 29:15
pins 28:24 29:1,3 29:6 30:11
pipe 105:19
pipeline 99:15
pit 115:14
place 15:2 20:16 27:4 29:11 68:4 87:12 88:3,4,5,13 92:9 106:3 112:7 113:7,11
places 79:1 87:10 123:13
plan 101:21
planned 105:23
planner 2:3
planning 2:4,17 24:9 30:2 33:1 47:14 91:9 98:18 100:17 108:13 123:12,16
play 88:11 100:7 100:12 125:1
playground 81:9
please 3:15 4:8 5:18 6:12,13,17,20 7:4 8:3 11:6 61:11 66:7 79:17,22,24 88:21 99:21 101:2 106:13 123:3
pleased 67:6
plenty 96:4 108:6 118:21
plus 58:2
pluses 16:10 32:9 33:7
point 9:3 10:10,15 22:6 25:11 35:10 36:13 38:11 43:12 45:16 46:11 50:24 60:1,7 64:5 66:5 81:8 109:9 114:4 121:1
pointed 35:14 79:1 80:22 111:4
points 27:24 41:2 45:12 48:19,22 50:4,17,18 77:3
police 28:23
policy 65:6
poo 107:12
pooed 107:12
pool 111:23 112:1 112:17
population 93:3
portion 8:13 56:16
possible 22:19 36:16 101:12 111:23 112:1 119:15
possibly 85:24
posted 5:4,13 78:18 124:14
potential 32:2 73:2
potentially 95:19
poverman 2:14 3:9,16,17 20:20,21 21:3 24:8,14 25:18 26:8 52:14 53:3,21 56:10 60:17 61:14,21 62:4,8,15 63:5,14 75:17 78:8,10,24 79:9 99:11 108:23 109:1 110:2 112:22 113:4
powers 122:8,8,15 122:18,23 123:20 123:23 124:4
practicable 64:8
practice 4:23
predecessor 8:8
predict 92:13
predicted 102:17
preferential 57:6
premature 59:2
prepared 12:16
present 3:14 4:2,4 51:16 78:20 83:13 99:19
presentation 12:4
presentations 95:23
preserve 87:6
pretty 23:5 67:10 70:23 83:21 114:16,19 121:7
prevent 32:4,5
previous 80:10
previously 26:2 31:14 95:12
price 86:23 105:3 112:12
prices 104:2
primarily 43:21 48:4 81:13
primary 124:15
principals 82:16
prior 4:15 9:22 39:7
priority 80:13 120:9
private 6:20 25:24 27:1 65:16,17
probability 89:8 90:3
probably 14:11 15:3 23:2 25:12 27:1,19 28:17 58:2 71:17,18,20 74:15 82:12 85:6 91:22 112:18
problem 31:23 36:6 63:13 90:3 91:17
problematic 19:16
problems 81:3 83:13,18 112:22
proceedings 126:9 126:11
process 70:24 76:1 111:15 114:23
professionally 81:15
program 41:11 86:3 116:5
prohibit 75:14
prohibitive 115:16
project 7:14 12:14 18:10 19:8,14 25:17 27:3 38:18 39:1 43:14 44:17 46:2 47:7,17 48:11 51:6 54:5,9

55:19 61:2 66:20 69:6 70:4,17 72:23 89:1,3,13 90:21 96:12 99:14 101:8 109:6 122:11 124:17
projected 102:19 103:8
projects 46:5,19 47:3,8 49:14 50:7 50:13,23 51:23 70:15 93:22 98:20
promote 11:2 19:6 61:11 66:7 69:20 79:19 99:20,23
promoted 7:9 93:16 122:4
promoting 19:17 30:13
proper 108:6,11
properties 21:14 27:7 46:10,12 96:21
property 3:5 46:5 46:11 54:19 63:22 111:19 118:9
proposed 14:18 18:11 47:1,7 51:6 64:9 69:2 91:19 103:12 121:3
pros 15:16 16:1
prospective 61:21 98:20,23 99:6,9
protect 97:10
protocol 100:3
prove 83:9
provide 6:11 10:22 23:18 33:14 40:15 69:22 70:8 77:24 102:17,20
provided 5:7,24 8:6 21:8 33:16 34:10,19 35:7 41:15 42:10,15 47:11 48:6 49:16 51:2 53:5 60:22 67:3 75:10 78:21 121:8
provides 42:10
providing 20:8 47:16 54:6 78:4
provision 77:2
proximate 49:13
proximity 43:17
public 1:6 5:1,7,8 5:8,11,14 6:24 7:2 7:12,19,24 8:18 9:3,6 19:2 25:15 25:22 31:12 44:1 59:14 79:15,21 97:24 101:1 108:18 111:5 118:4,4 121:22,24 126:6,19
publicly 5:2
pull 30:14 95:3,4 97:14 116:20
purely 41:21 44:19 49:22
purpose 120:22
purposes 7:8
push 29:12
put 19:23 27:8 57:16 58:6 65:11 91:9 93:6 97:7 102:2 108:8 109:8 112:15
putting 101:11
puzzle 51:21 52:6 114:17

q

qualitative 107:15
quantifiable 32:23
quantify 34:11 36:19 37:7
quantitative 107:14
question 20:20,21 22:10 24:13 26:18 27:21 28:1,21 30:21 33:10 36:4 36:5 56:3,13,17 58:24 60:22 63:17 64:6 76:4 78:8 80:15 81:10,23 98:7,15 100:23 110:1,23 114:8,9 115:7 116:4,11 117:14 119:5,8,20
questions 6:12 15:21 24:7 26:10 26:12,19 37:18 39:6,9 41:9 51:15 52:11 54:3 65:20 66:4 67:23 71:5 108:20 115:21
quick 14:7
quickly 38:7 46:9 85:23 121:21
quite 25:8 35:3 71:9 80:7,18 103:22 104:11 121:13,16

r

r 2:1 3:1 126:1,5 126:18
radar 34:23,24,24 74:12
raise 7:17
raised 15:21 66:4 79:18 121:23
ramp 60:1,8
ramps 23:18 40:7 67:15 115:2
randolph 2:15 3:10,22,23 4:2,5 37:16,17 63:16 65:19 79:10 90:20 114:6
range 34:6 36:22 42:23 43:24 44:8 44:15,23 46:6 47:4 50:14 51:3,5 51:5 58:12 77:3 114:10 116:4
rate 83:20 88:16 105:24
rates 77:2 107:1
ratio 42:11,17 44:14 46:24 47:20 48:13 49:10 54:9 58:11
ratios 47:4 48:10 53:1
raved 104:2
read 8:3 25:18 67:16
readily 57:21
readings 75:1
real 31:22 43:24 81:12 88:14 107:13
realistic 96:7,8
realistically 58:3
reality 73:22
really 10:11 11:24 12:24 18:2,2,3 19:6 25:3,4 30:12 31:11,20 32:8 33:23 34:11,20

36:19 42:16 48:17 50:6 51:15 60:4 62:12 65:15 69:17 71:14 72:2 73:10 77:19 78:1 80:10 82:19,22 84:17 85:18 88:24 94:13 97:2 100:9 103:3 105:15 107:2,19 107:21 108:4,4,10 108:14 112:3,7,16 112:16 117:2 120:24
realtor 104:14
rear 104:7
reason 90:10 92:7 110:4 118:12,17
reasonable 49:10
reasons 21:5 50:9 53:3 89:4 105:2
rebuttals 14:16
receive 45:11 70:6
received 7:11 12:21 78:6 122:18 122:20
recommenced 68:5
recommend 17:21 19:3 51:24
recommendation 23:15 51:3 69:5
recommendations 67:4,8,19,19 68:2
recommended 36:8 67:14 100:17 118:1,3
reconcile 119:20
reconvening 3:3
record 3:7 73:11 126:11
recorded 9:16 126:9
recording 5:22 9:14
redesign 121:11
reduce 38:23 69:12 76:11 91:6 108:1
reduced 21:10 52:19 53:2 72:12 76:21 77:19 78:19
reducing 47:16 67:15 76:12
reduction 18:24 22:17 23:3,12 25:13 26:23 76:18
reductions 22:14 22:21,24 57:11
refer 21:5 52:15 53:9 79:2
reference 82:22
referred 78:13
referring 78:11
reflect 76:6
reflected 56:24 57:24
regarding 20:5
regardless 22:22
regards 17:16 42:5 45:14 72:19
register 64:12
registered 33:22
regrettably 31:19
regretted 112:13
reich 98:2,5,5 99:2 99:16 100:22
reinforces 72:11
reiterate 41:11 97:16
rejoins 85:13
related 12:2 27:21 51:10 71:3 76:4
relates 114:9
relating 33:11 60:19 109:4
relation 16:16 52:20 53:5
relationship 114:16
relatively 14:18 16:22 17:4 49:13 49:21 53:15 58:22 85:5 111:2
relevant 12:24
reliance 29:24
relying 70:22 71:24
remain 86:23
remarks 6:10
remember 6:14 23:23
remind 10:8
remote 1:11 59:22
remotely 4:16 5:6
removed 77:18
renotice 123:8
renovated 104:8,8
rent 112:2,6,18 120:5,8,16,18
rental 43:14 44:3 55:17 64:1 79:7 107:1
rented 63:8,10 79:5
renter 43:21
renters 43:13
renting 55:4 56:5
rents 105:21
repeat 8:6
report 7:17 11:22 35:15 47:15,15,21 47:23 48:24 58:16 67:4,6,17
reported 103:11
reporter 126:6
reports 22:20 63:21
represents 47:19
request 10:21,23
requested 119:23
require 28:15 29:12,16 36:12 114:1
required 5:10 13:9 42:6 52:19
requirement 4:24 119:21
requirements 45:18,24 52:18,20
requires 46:3
requiring 16:8
requisite 74:7
research 47:23 69:7 107:14,15 108:7,11
residence 115:4
resident 106:16
residential 13:17 15:1 27:18 41:12 48:3,5
residents 27:5 38:19 42:10,18 71:15 115:24 117:2
resolved 51:14
resources 54:18
respect 67:13,24 68:11 69:4 80:21
respond 3:16 4:8 7:23 66:3,14
responded 16:18 51:11

responding 6:17 70:10
response 10:24 46:4 70:9 74:10 78:2,2
responses 41:7 78:5
restaurant 91:8
restricted 46:21
result 20:1,3 32:18
resulting 69:13
results 17:7
retail 15:1 21:2 41:15 42:2,4,7,9 47:8 52:23 53:5 101:10 114:18,21 114:22 115:23 116:1,4
retailers 29:2,3
return 25:10
review 7:19,21,22 7:23 8:23,24 10:19,20 12:4,6,8 12:20 40:15 41:5 45:17 51:9 63:21 66:3 70:6 76:1 122:16 124:16 125:5
reviewed 75:24
reviewer 40:12 69:10
reviewers 67:9 69:17,23
reviews 12:13 42:21
richard 79:20 80:5 89:6
ride 19:5,24 57:18 68:8 88:3
riders 105:15
riding 90:5
right 7:7 12:1 13:10 14:17 15:14 22:9 23:8 25:7,12 27:16 30:14 31:2 31:2,15,16 33:18 35:16,19 39:16,19 43:11,21 46:1 49:1,2,5 54:7 70:11 72:9,10 81:7,8 85:1 86:5,6 86:8 89:20,22 91:7,10,15 96:6,19 104:13 105:4 111:8,24 114:14 116:14 119:6 120:22 121:3,5 122:22 124:5
risk 65:3 97:9 112:3,4,17
roach 2:23
road 15:11 81:16 92:5 94:10
roads 102:3
roadway 17:5 18:4 36:18
roadways 13:24 14:4 15:14
rock 105:4
roll 6:22
room 3:11 101:15
route 14:2 43:22 77:9 78:14
routines 105:13
rules 6:6 14:11 38:22
run 32:17
running 74:24
runoff 77:22
runs 72:9
rush 32:22
russell 73:18 94:8
ruthless 102:1

s

s 2:1 3:1
sac 38:4
safe 107:21
safer 24:3
safety 31:12 38:23 93:24 101:23
sales 25:21
sample 96:3
samples 96:7
saw 91:13 92:1 104:23
saying 32:8 70:21 109:6
says 21:8 54:10 63:20
scale 24:23 107:12
scenario 16:11 32:14
scenarios 16:11 119:16
schedule 7:20 10:11,16 124:21 125:1
scheduled 8:21
schemes 114:10
schneider 2:13 3:9 3:20,21 26:11,15 26:17 27:21 28:21 29:9 30:6,21 33:9 33:20 36:3,7 37:15 54:1,17 55:15 56:7,13 58:8,24 60:14 76:4 110:4,22 118:23 119:19 121:15
scholarship 90:8
school 37:14 87:22 90:8 101:17
schrenker 2:18 40:14,16,19,21,23 43:8 52:9,15,22 53:13,23 54:16,24 55:22 57:9 58:14 59:8 60:15 63:18 64:16 65:16,22 66:1 76:23
science 39:10,12 39:13,24
scone 53:19
scoot 88:2
scope 99:8
scott 2:22 66:13 69:14,19,20 70:2 100:8
screen 5:20 7:6 40:24 43:1 48:15 76:23
seal 126:14
second 18:1 43:2,9
section 7:5
see 5:19 17:23 26:15 29:21 35:24 49:12 50:2,6,12 52:12 56:4 57:14 58:4 61:3 82:21 85:12,22 86:5,9 89:9,10 91:2,4,11 100:12 107:23 114:15 117:4 123:14,17 124:3 125:12
seeing 48:3 57:10 58:18
seen 15:15 48:18 51:22 67:10 97:12

sell 38:11
selling 86:24
semiautomated 51:21
sending 27:17 123:11
senior 2:3
sense 28:17 30:18 34:22 38:4 55:16 118:16
separately 120:21
september 1:16 8:22 12:22 122:14 122:15 123:8 124:12
serious 95:5 97:15 106:7 108:15
seriously 107:3
serve 72:23 112:9 113:16 117:10 118:6 119:13
served 72:1 111:5
service 89:24 94:3
services 97:19
servicing 68:9 90:24
session 4:16
set 43:7 125:3 126:13
seven 41:13,17 47:18 68:17 69:7 112:4 120:20
shaking 52:12
shape 109:14
share 5:20 19:5,24 40:24 43:1,2 48:14 57:18 103:9 103:20 108:12
shared 27:24 28:16 106:8
shares 68:8
shift 56:22 57:22
shifts 57:5,6
shimon's 62:4,6 63:4 95:19,20
ship 93:6
ships 93:8
shmukler 106:11 106:15
short 18:4
shorten 23:20
shortly 14:21 20:17
shovels 102:19
show 92:20
showed 63:23
showing 56:15 57:4 77:19 78:11
shows 48:16,19
sic 16:4
side 16:8 18:10 21:10 35:20 59:15 92:5
sidewalk 16:6 33:5 67:15
sign 14:10
signature 126:17
significant 108:3
signs 15:13
similar 25:2 41:1,4 46:24 59:9 62:2 91:19,20
similarly 21:23
simply 83:11
single 89:12 94:17 94:23 117:23
sit 105:9
site 13:5,22 14:4 15:18 16:13,15 17:8,9,13,16 23:10 23:11,23 24:5 25:2 33:11,12,21 34:7 35:23 36:15 38:24 40:5 44:1 49:13 67:24 69:2 72:9,12 73:24 74:1 75:9,15 77:15 82:17 100:4 100:13 109:16,18 110:10 115:1 124:14
sites 48:3 77:11 109:13 123:21
situation 64:4 80:19 82:5 117:22
six 20:8 41:15 42:10 51:20 68:16 73:21 81:14,18 83:7 95:9 103:12 103:13 112:4 113:5 114:16 118:24 119:2,11 120:20
size 37:12 53:14 109:23 111:17 122:11
skill 126:12
slated 93:14
sleep 38:4
slides 63:23
slight 81:5
slim 23:24
slip 26:24
slow 16:22 23:21 34:15 36:1 37:1
slowed 81:6 95:10
slower 36:18
slowing 36:11
small 52:2 53:15 110:20
smaller 109:18
smith 122:3,9
sneezed 106:17
social 76:19
solution 28:14
somebody 31:14 64:12 89:22 121:23
someplace 29:14 55:20 83:23
somewhat 39:20 46:23 76:5 94:15
sorry 4:1 11:5,6 30:5 36:3 39:11 43:2 61:4 84:4 88:23 103:2 112:21
sort 31:19 54:22 56:22 63:24 64:10 72:1 78:1 80:13 115:2 125:1
sorts 57:19
sources 9:18
south 64:18
space 15:4 17:19 17:21 18:1,5,12,14 18:17,19,20 19:23 20:2,3 40:1,3 41:17 42:3,12 46:11 47:9 63:11 64:11 77:21 78:12 82:19 95:3 101:10 105:18 111:11 117:23 118:1,19 119:4 120:10,11 120:13,16,17,18 121:9
spaces 14:19 20:8 20:23 41:16,18,22 41:23 42:6,6,7,8,8 42:10,11,13 44:9 44:15,16 45:7,8

47:18,20 51:20 53:5 55:4,5,17,21 56:5 60:21 61:16 63:2 68:17 69:7 73:21 76:14 77:1 77:4,23 78:12,20 78:21 81:23 98:24 109:20 110:10,20 111:3,7,12 112:4 113:6,15 114:17 117:11 118:20 119:1,3,4 120:6,8
span 18:15 27:14
speak 6:15 7:2,13 56:11 64:16 79:17 85:18 93:14,21 98:7 99:18 117:21 118:5 120:1
speaker 6:9 97:24 98:1 101:1 102:8 106:10
speakers 4:14 79:21 80:10
speaking 4:15 6:15,19 20:17
specific 6:5 9:19 39:10 78:22
specifically 7:18 63:20 86:11 100:14
speculate 59:10
speed 16:19 32:20 33:14 34:4,5 35:4 35:11,16 60:4 74:2,19,20,22 75:6 81:6 94:11,14
speeding 15:13 91:2
speeds 16:21 17:1 17:4,11,14 34:23 36:18 75:3,5
spending 82:3
spilling 104:23
split 75:23
spoke 89:6 104:16 105:17
spot 18:3,8 19:18 26:20 27:11 28:10 28:11,16,19 29:13 92:9,11,11
spots 30:15
spring 103:1,5
square 21:2 41:14 42:3 53:15 114:18
ss 126:3
stabilize 62:14
stabilized 62:12
stackers 110:11,12 110:16,19,21 112:14
staff 4:7 7:16 11:22
standard 70:24 74:4,9
standards 14:23 20:11
standpoint 14:1 27:15 41:8 44:3 45:3
start 8:3 11:22 35:20 38:13 52:11 60:7 79:16 86:5 102:17,22 103:8 125:7
started 11:5 71:4
starting 32:15
starts 96:12
state 4:19 6:18 85:24
stated 19:11
station 61:23 62:3 62:6 63:4
stations 30:11
statistical 50:10
step 43:18 121:12
sticking 28:17
stock 86:18
stop 101:18,21 105:6,7 124:22
stopping 17:9
stops 72:10
store 55:9
stories 81:18 103:11
story 85:9 115:1
straight 91:10
strange 104:15
street 1:7 2:6 3:6 13:12,15,18 15:2,4 17:7,10,18 18:19 20:2,14,14 21:15 21:15,16,18 27:8 27:16 31:20 32:16 33:3 35:20 37:5 38:1,8,15 39:4 41:17 46:20 47:3 61:1,23 64:4,11,21 65:1,12 68:6,20 72:10,20,22,24 73:8,16,19 74:14 74:21 75:12,15,19 80:5,22,23 81:1,4 81:24 83:11,14 84:17,19,22 85:5,7 85:8,11 86:6,6 87:21 89:11,16 90:5,12,23 91:3,8 91:20 93:4 94:5,7 94:8,10,13 95:1,15 95:15 96:19,22,22 97:1,7,8,12 98:6 98:13 101:15 102:14 104:24 106:15,20 107:24 109:4,6,15,21 110:17,17 111:13 112:15 114:15 116:21,23
streets 80:18 90:16 91:4 96:20 96:23 97:6 117:1 117:3
stretch 14:11 75:14
strikes 83:7
strongly 69:5
student 90:7,7
students 90:11
studied 47:24 70:15 100:10
studies 36:21 75:20 98:19 99:8 108:5,8
studios 41:12
study 48:22 56:4 98:10,22
studying 48:4 59:9 60:10
stuff 37:14
subject 39:16 100:11,19
submitted 66:17 95:11 109:5
suboptimal 36:14
subsequent 123:10
substantially 47:11
sufficient 8:9 54:6 99:16
suggesting 58:10 121:17
summary 20:19
summer 80:19

supplies 55:3
supply 46:6 48:6 55:17
support 20:10 66:17,20 69:5
supporting 5:23
supposed 30:15
sure 15:12 25:7 30:23 35:10 37:11 53:23 54:24 59:1 59:2,8 60:15 62:15 63:13 66:1 66:21 77:10 85:14 99:22,24 103:23 104:11 115:18 116:17 117:20 118:7 119:18,24
surprised 86:12 105:16
surprisingly 85:13
surround 97:6
survey 71:11
surveys 81:14
susie 102:8,9
suspect 57:13,14 81:22 83:23 84:16
suspended 5:3
suspicions 83:8,10
swing 37:13
switching 3:24
sylvia 122:3,9
system 51:21,21 83:18 112:15 115:14
systems 52:6 57:19 84:1

t

t 118:15 126:1,1
take 3:23 5:19 8:18 20:16 22:7 22:11 42:21,22 43:18 45:8 48:18 51:12,17,23 52:5 58:1 59:14 64:10 75:21 88:1,1 97:9 97:12 98:19 108:9 118:14 122:1
taken 6:21 9:16 22:21 74:13,15 96:8 99:1,5 112:8 120:9
takes 24:20 62:14 62:18
talk 29:6 43:3 124:21
talked 27:12 29:1 89:7 95:7 111:22 121:13
talking 18:9 49:6 50:16 53:14 59:3 73:20 89:3 104:12 115:14
tandem 95:1
team 41:6 67:7 119:10
technically 17:13
technology 51:24
tell 63:3 86:24 89:9 99:7 107:8
telling 117:17
temporarily 95:4
ten 35:1,2 41:24 45:5,9 56:23 57:7 58:2 75:3 76:7
tenant 61:21 111:23
tenants 79:7 96:18 96:20,21 112:1
tend 32:20 81:4 94:11
tendency 32:6
tends 74:24
tennis 85:1
term 52:17 57:20
terms 26:4 53:8 61:7 63:10 70:9 70:13,14,15 72:13 74:1 75:11 76:2 76:22 108:8 109:14
terrific 39:8
testimony 8:3,11 8:18 79:16 108:21
thank 4:7,13 10:4 11:15,16,19 12:12 24:6 37:15 39:5 40:10 43:8 52:7 52:10,14 53:22 54:1,2 60:14 63:15 65:18,21,22 66:1,7,9,9 69:23 70:2,4 78:7 79:9 79:12,13 80:3,4 84:22 85:17 88:19 88:20,22,23 93:11 93:20 97:22 98:6 100:22 102:7 106:9 108:15 115:17 117:3 121:18 124:5 125:10
theory 20:9 25:11 35:15,19,24
thing 9:13 21:12 24:19 30:9 32:13 32:23 37:20 98:17 105:20 111:14 114:13 117:8
things 8:2 10:18 15:17 18:21 19:2 19:5 22:8 23:6 26:3 31:4,5 32:17 33:12 40:24 60:8 62:21 66:12 75:16 75:24 78:13 81:7 84:12 95:9 108:3 111:21,22
think 8:16 11:6 19:19 21:4 22:1,2 22:6 24:17 26:24 27:11 29:20 30:1 30:4,8,9 32:8 33:11 34:12,13 36:9 37:20 39:7 40:1,4,8,9 42:23 43:4 44:24 45:18 45:19 48:9 50:14 51:1,16 53:13 54:5,12 57:8 58:8 58:14 60:1 64:23 65:7 68:7,12 69:16 70:10,12,18 72:11,15,21,21 73:3,4,11,15 74:18 75:7,17 76:2,20 77:17 78:1 79:5 80:2,9,13,17,22 83:6,17 84:13,16 84:19 85:6 86:22 87:9 93:21 94:13 95:5 96:7,15 97:15 98:16 100:22 102:2,3,4 107:3,4,10,19 108:2,7,14 111:14 111:20,22 112:18 113:19 115:13,20 117:6,13 119:5,19 121:16,22 122:9 124:19,20 125:4
thinking 112:11
thornton 2:22 66:13 69:15,21

70:1,2 78:10,17 79:4,13 99:23 100:15,24
thought 24:12 30:19 63:8 80:8
thoughts 26:10 89:1 108:20
three 18:15 19:19 27:14 41:12,13,13 41:23 44:6 47:6 49:14 59:20 72:7 92:3 104:6 105:3
throughs 80:24
throw 120:5
tight 10:11 115:1
tighten 23:20 37:3
tightened 37:10
tightening 23:19 24:2 34:14 36:24 37:8 40:7
time 8:17 9:4 11:19 14:11,11 15:9 16:23 18:22 19:24 25:17 28:3 48:15 51:17 58:1 59:23 60:9 62:14 74:10,15 77:13 84:8 88:24 91:13 93:11 96:2,4,5 97:23 102:23 103:3 104:20 107:23 108:6 109:2 110:12 120:3
timeline 125:3
times 10:14 18:17 25:20 40:23 47:6 68:12 92:12 96:1 105:3
timing 44:5 58:16
tiny 34:3
tip 34:4
today 46:16
todd 28:21 29:6 67:21
toddlers 87:23
told 61:22 62:1 63:7 104:14
tonight 8:14 12:24 40:13 70:10 78:3 118:8 121:20 122:19
tonight's 6:5 7:16
top 41:24 63:2
topic 12:2 13:4 14:19 16:12 17:17 25:9 124:16
topics 7:18 8:13,15 20:12 79:17
total 41:17 42:6,6 72:17
totally 114:4
touch 46:9 47:21 124:23,24
touched 39:8
towed 64:22
town 1:5 2:5 6:1 10:12 28:3 29:16 30:1,20 45:15 46:2,18 67:14 86:4,20 103:21 123:13,14 124:1,4 124:13
town's 5:14 9:23 54:13 75:13
track 43:10,10,13 44:6,7,24 50:9 56:14
tracks 42:22 43:18 43:20 44:6,12,13 44:20,22 57:5
tract 75:23
tradeoff 88:10
trades 42:1 45:9
traditionally 29:23
traffic 7:21 8:14 10:20 12:8,14,15 12:20 13:22 14:2 14:5 22:3 23:22 24:11 25:8,17 26:4,7 27:7 30:3 31:17 32:11 33:13 36:11,20 37:2,22 37:24 69:12,14 70:3,13 73:7,13 80:14,16,17 81:11 85:7 92:22 94:5 96:9 98:11,19,22 99:13 100:6,18
train 88:1
transcribed 126:10
transcript 9:15 126:11
transcripts 9:21
transit 22:18 23:13 25:15 26:24 52:16 55:13 71:8 72:2,4 77:14,14,18 101:20
transition 59:23
transmission 4:22
transportation 18:6 19:2,21 25:23 28:22 36:9 44:2 59:14 67:2 67:20 68:1,5 76:16 82:13 111:5 117:24 119:22 120:4 121:7
trash 18:22 37:14
travel 13:19 14:2 14:13 15:6
tree 103:23
tremendous 61:19
trend 76:21 94:16 98:13
trends 50:11 58:9 58:9 72:1 76:6
trip 14:22 19:1,9 20:5,9,22 21:6,7 21:12 70:15,16,19 70:22 71:6 72:14 73:24 75:19
trips 21:9,11,19,21 21:24 22:2,5,8,8 25:13 71:3,7,7,13 71:15 72:16 73:20
trouble 84:9
truck 37:13,14
trucks 92:10 96:14
true 17:3 73:16 76:24 79:4 122:12 126:11
try 20:14 32:4 38:14 89:18
trying 9:5 35:5 51:4 52:3 54:13 65:11 101:19 104:5 105:2
tube 35:12 74:13 74:24
turn 13:9 14:12 15:3 31:2,7,16 32:2,3 66:12 68:24 69:19 89:18 89:19,19 91:7 93:16 94:12 97:13 98:2 101:2 102:9 106:11 107:22 116:7,11 122:4

turned 31:15 94:18
turning 6:4 13:11 16:21 17:5 35:11 35:17,19,22 38:20 68:11,16 74:23
two 17:12,23 20:12 24:1 25:3 39:22 41:13,22,23 43:20 44:12,20,22 44:23 62:18 67:3 74:4 78:5 80:12 81:6 84:21 87:22 92:3 94:17,19,24 95:23 98:10 112:7 118:19 119:15 123:13 125:4
type 36:11 52:1 71:1 77:13
types 72:3 105:21 105:24 116:14
typical 100:3
typically 17:1 32:4 42:20 50:12 55:1
typo 42:5

u

uber 18:21 19:5 22:7 24:11 26:18 27:2,23,24 28:6,9 28:16,24 29:13,24 57:18 92:9,19 116:18
ubers 27:4 90:1 97:22 105:18
um 54:16
un 113:23 119:21 120:2,14,22
unable 65:9
underestimate 107:11
underestimated 22:5
underground 115:15
understand 10:7 12:5 30:24 31:22 40:13 45:23 50:15 61:7 70:21 73:1 82:8,9,24 97:2 117:9,15,18
understanding 37:23 48:6 52:17 52:22 53:1 68:21
understands 116:18
undertake 40:11
unduly 27:6
unexpectedly 33:7
unfortunate 90:18
unfortunately 48:21 55:23 60:12 91:16
unhappy 93:7
unit 42:11,14 43:15 44:9,16 46:7,8 47:20 50:14,23 69:3 77:4 81:23 101:7 104:5,6,9 113:5 117:23 118:1 119:2 120:11 121:12
units 20:23 21:1 21:15,16,18,19,20 21:23 22:1 41:12 41:23,24 44:20 45:4 61:4 62:19 71:2 75:18 77:24 79:7,8 81:19 83:7 86:22,24 88:12,12 93:4 98:24 104:4 105:22 111:17,18 113:4,17,20 114:2 119:14
unloading 18:21
unmute 79:24 88:21
unused 78:12
unusual 80:19
unworkable 114:22
upcoming 57:24 123:18
updated 12:17 57:1
upgrading 23:16 40:6
ups 68:9 91:2 92:9 116:19
upset 103:19
upstairs 103:18
urban 39:19 107:17
usage 30:13
use 18:19 19:23 25:22 27:2 34:21 38:19 42:22 52:1 52:5 55:8,9 71:19 76:16 78:22 82:23 83:2 101:19 111:11 115:1 116:22 117:1 121:2,4
useful 9:12 48:17
user 46:23
uses 15:1 18:20 19:5,6,18 23:4 68:19 116:4,14
usual 39:6
usually 98:21
utilization 87:9
utilized 78:16

v

vaccine 60:6
vai 2:22,23 12:16 12:21 16:18 21:8 99:5 100:5
valid 104:18
value 35:7
vanasse 45:12 70:3
vans 68:9
various 67:5
vehicle 34:16 35:17 37:12 71:7 71:19 72:16 73:7 73:20 74:20,23 120:12
vehicles 14:6 15:20 17:23 27:1 42:19 57:21 71:13 72:5,15,17 73:2,15 73:17,23 79:8 89:17,21,24 92:2,3 92:5
veksler 88:23 104:16
venice 93:6,7
verify 99:19
verndale 39:3 68:19,23,24 72:10 73:18 85:11 86:6 86:7 98:6 101:7 104:21 106:20 122:9
version 47:24
versus 17:10 72:20
vicinity 56:6
victor 2:17 4:11 7:9 43:4,5 61:10 66:6 69:20 79:18 93:13 99:21 124:7

video 5:13,18 9:16 93:17 98:3 101:3 102:10 106:12 122:5
view 103:17
violation 17:13
virginia 113:22 120:2
virtually 95:2
virus 4:21
visibility 17:17 91:7 108:1
vision 26:20
visiting 116:19
visitor 44:18
visitors 42:1 45:9 94:4
visits 39:1
vitaly 88:21
volume 13:22 102:15
volumes 25:8 70:13 100:6
vote 6:21,23 101:11

w

wait 6:17 52:13 92:5 112:24 113:1 113:18 124:20
waiting 56:1 92:20
walk 53:11,18 81:16 88:2 101:16 107:6
walkable 111:6
walker 2:18 14:20 20:16 40:14 42:19 47:22 51:23 70:8 84:3,4
walking 16:5 19:2 22:18 33:4 53:7
wall 103:20
want 8:2,7,11 9:19 13:16 19:10 23:7 25:22 29:8 30:23 31:21 32:21 40:23 43:9 45:13 55:19 56:10 65:8 66:3 66:21 68:15 69:14 72:13 80:12 85:14 85:23 86:21 87:12 88:8,9 91:21 92:8 94:11,20 96:11 97:13,16,21 99:18 99:22 100:8 101:11,22 105:24 107:18 112:2 114:20 115:19 116:11,17 117:18 118:10 119:2,3 120:20 121:24 125:10
wanted 10:5 15:11 32:13 33:15 67:21 68:24 75:14 99:19 104:17 105:17 106:19 108:12 117:7,15 120:16
wants 62:9 83:1
warrants 45:14,23
washington 2:6
wasted 77:21,21
way 6:16 14:9 22:7 24:22 28:8 29:17 39:3 40:4 59:2 81:12 84:24 90:5 95:16 97:15 101:17,20 102:5 107:9 110:13 114:2 118:4
ways 38:17 68:21
we've 15:15 29:1 41:6 47:22 57:9 78:3 87:24 95:7 96:4 108:21 118:3 118:7 125:5
website 6:1 9:24 48:15,17 123:12
wednesday 1:16 124:11 125:13
week 8:21 41:6 59:20 63:10 70:8 74:15 103:1 121:20 124:11,20
week's 124:15,16
weekends 55:10
weigh 12:1
weighed 19:21
weighing 29:21
welcome 85:20 100:24 124:6
went 67:1
whatsoever 95:15
whereof 126:13
who've 38:22
wide 36:22
wider 34:6
willing 10:7
winding 101:13
window 7:7 91:5
winter 84:11
wipe 103:17
wisdom 9:1
wise 19:20 98:11
wish 6:19 7:2 110:5,18,21 111:7
wished 109:7
witness 126:13
woman 103:18 105:17
wonder 80:20 83:14,15 84:6
wondering 24:9 60:17 61:2,5
words 7:15
work 28:3,15 40:9 55:13 59:16,21 68:18 84:7 89:10 118:12,15 119:9
worked 115:12
worker 55:2
working 25:14 27:23 59:19 84:15 85:15 107:6 112:16
works 28:8 39:10 39:12,13,24
world 34:9
worried 31:6,13
worry 38:5 59:11 81:10 107:21
worth 87:9 120:24
write 95:24
writing 95:12
written 80:8
wrong 84:5 89:11 89:15,24 90:6,17 91:14 92:5 97:14 107:9
wrote 47:17

y

yard 86:8
yeah 26:6,8 29:9 30:4,8 61:14 65:16 80:1 100:15 109:13 110:2 117:6 121:15 122:2 124:23
year 62:18 71:21 95:14 98:10 102:24 103:5
years 24:20 38:9 46:13 56:23 57:7

58:2,17,21 76:7
86:13,14,17 94:5
106:16 107:15
113:1,1
yielded 6:18
york 25:20
young 106:20,24

z

zba 4:15 5:12
10:14,17
zero 46:7,10
zip 88:2 118:14
121:5
zone 19:24 26:21
40:4 50:13 68:4,6
86:1,3 97:18
116:22
zones 19:13,14
zoning 41:18,21
42:7 45:22 51:10
52:18,20
zoom 1:11 5:13
43:9 85:12 123:21
124:3,12
zuroff 7:14